The Nation

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1916.

Summary of the News

News came from Washington in dispatches of Monday's date that Germany had submitted to the United States another proposal designed to effect a final settlement of the Lusitania controversy. No official information as to the details of this latest proposal is available as we write, but correspondents in Washington believe that Germany is ready to eliminate from the note certain passages which were regarded as objectionable by the United States, particularly an allusion to the warning published by the Germany Embassy before the Lusitania sailed. It is also stated that the question of admitting wrong-doing may be solved by the nice technicality of Germany's accepting blame for the assassination of American citizens, but not for the act itself. The "freedom of the seas" is said to be one of the points brought into prominence, and Germany is understood to reiterate her assertion that the torpedoing of the Lusitania was undertaken as a measure of reprisal for the British blockade. If the last statement is true, it is worth recalling that, in the actual sequence of events, the submarine campaign was inaugurated by Germany prior to the British blockade, which was expressly stated to be Britain's answer to the attempted German blockade by submarines.

Germany's denial of any responsibility for the torpedoing of the Persia is to be followed by a similar disclaimer by Austria, according to dispatches from Vienna of January 22, which stated that the Austrian Government had informed Ambassador Penfield to that effect. There was a report from London by way of Berlin and Amsterdam on Sunday that the Turkish Ministry of Marine was about to publish a statement assuming responsibility for the sinking of the Persia, but no confirmation of the report has been received, and it may probably be dismissed as a wild rumor. The State Department, however, according to dispatches from Washington on Monday, will make inquiries of the Turkish Government to ascertain if the Persia was sunk by a Turkish submarine.

The Austrian announcement of the unconditional surrender of Montenegro, which we recorded last week, appears to have been premature. An official statement issued in Paris on January 19 announced that negotiations had been broken off, and on the following day fighting was apparently resumed. Ugly stories concerning the good faith of King Nicholas obtained currency last week, it being stated that he had for months been negotiating with Austria, and that fighting in Montenegro for some time had been merely a pretence. These stories have been hotly denied, and it should be recorded, at least, that such conduct as has been suspected would be contrary to all the traditions of the Montenegrin people. The King and Queen of Montenegro have gone to Italy on their way to Lyons, and a part of the Montenegrin army has apparently also crossed the Adriatic. The official Austrian statement on Monday announced the occupation of Scutari.

There were reports last week that the Allies had presented an ultimatum to Greece, and that it had been rejected. What precisely the terms of the ultimatum were supposed to be was not stated, and no official confirmation of any move of the kind has been received. King Constantine, pursuing the habit, irregular in a constitutional monarch, to which he has recently become much addicted, issued, on January 13, through the Associated Press, an appeal to America, on which we comment elsewhere. This plaintive document had been held up by the censorship while a well-reasoned reply to it was framed by some one described as "the highest French authority." It was finally published here on January 20. The release of the German, Austrian, Turkish, and Bulgarian Consuls at Salonica, who were held under arrest by the Allies, has been obtained through the efforts of the State Department, on condition that they do not resume their functions at Salonica, but return to their own countries.

In retaliation for British seizures of mail, Sweden has adopted a decree, which went into effect on January 22, prohibiting the exportation of wood pulp. The measure is expected to cause a considerable increase in the price of paper in England, and not improbably may also affect this country.

The reply of the British Government to the last American note of protest in regard to the blockade has not yet been sent, but unofficial dispatches from London last week stated that it had been drafted and had been submitted for the approval of the French Government. A debate on the entire question of the blockade, its efficacy and the desirability of substituting a regular blockade for operations under Orders in Council, was expected to be held in the House of Commons yesterday. The matter was the subject of hot debate in the Senate on Thursday of last week. Meanwhile, another difference of opinion has arisen between this country and England as a result of the latter's "Trading with the Enemy" act, which prohibits persons resident in Great Britain from trading with any corporations or individuals that are engaged in supplying the Teutonic allies or that have business dealings with them. It was stated in Washington on Monday that representations in regard to this act, as it would affect commerce in the United States, had been prepared and would go forward immediately.

There has been comparative quiet on the various fronts of war. French official reports of Monday recorded the checking of a determined German offensive against the lines held by the Belgians. Substantial progress appears to have been made by the Russians in the Caucasus and in Persia; but in Mesopotamia the relief force under Gen. Aylmer has received a check, officially attributed in the House of Commons to the "atrocious weather," in its attempt to break through the Turks and relieve Gen. Townshend's army in Kut-el-Amara.

Three aeroplane raids over the east coast of England were recorded on Saturday and Sunday, one of them being over the fortifications at Dover. A French raid on Metz was recorded in the official statement of January 23.

The German press has been full of rumors, apparently inspired, of the likelihood of Belgium's concluding a separate peace, the rumors being accompanied by threats as to what will happen if Belgium fails to take the hint. A brief statement issued by the Belgian Minister of War from Le Havre on Monday declared that there was not "a shadow of truth" in these "evil-minded rumors." A report issued by the Belgian Government, a summary of which was given in dispatches of January 20, estimates the number of houses in Belgium burned by the Germans at 18,207.

The President, as at present arranged, is to start on his tour of speech-making in behalf of his policy of preparedness to-morrow. Mr. Bryan on Monday issued a statement denying that it was his intention to follow in the wake of the President through the Middle West replying to his arguments for preparedness.

Discussion of the Mexican situation was last week transferred from the floor of the Senate to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Democratic Senators opposed an effort made by the Republicans, under the leadership of Senator Lodge and Senator Borah, to induce the Committee to report favorably a resolution authorizing the President to use armed force in Mexico, and it is evident that the Democrats on the Committee are sufficiently of one mind to thwart any attempts to force the President into a more active policy. Two Mexican cattle thieves were executed on Sunday by the Carranzista authorities for the murder of an American, Bert Akers, at San Lorenzo.

The Supreme Court on January 24 unanimously sustained the constitutionality of the income tax provisions of the Underwood Tariff act.

The Military Service bill, providing for compulsion for unmarried men between the ages of eighteen and forty-one, passed its third reading in the House of Commons on Monday by a vote of 383 to 36, and was immediately sent to the House of Lords. On Friday of last week the House of Commons passed the supplementary navy estimates authorizing an increase of the personnel of the navy by 50,000 men. The first 100,000 of the recruits obtained under Lord Derby's scheme, unmarried men between the ages of nineteen and twenty-two, were summoned to the colors on January 20.

As a result of the uprising in Southern China, the coronation of Yuan Shi-Kai as Emperor has been postponed indefinitely. The postponement of the establishment of a monarchy in China was announced by the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Japanese House of Peers on January 22, and is regarded in Japan as evidence of an ascendency of Japanese influence in China.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Week

For the second time within a few months the King of Greece has appealed to public opinion in the United States against the high-handed treatment of his country by the Allies. If King Constantine is really so well informed about America as his allusion to our own Mexican War of seventy years ago would indicate, he must be aware that his appeal will miss its effect. He must know enough of how this country feels about Belgium to recognize how futile is his attempt to draw a parallel between the Germans at Liège, at Namur, at Louvain, and at Dinant, and the Allies at Salonica and in Corfu. The reply to Constantine's protest emanating from the "highest authority" in Paris, for all its quiet tone, is conclusive enough. The Allies did not come into Greece with fire and sword. They came virtually at the invitation of the Greek people, whose sympathies, the King admits, were 80 per cent. in their favor, and at the request of the Greek Government as embodied in Venizelos, the idolized statesman and the creator of New Greece. The Allies went into Gallipoli on the understanding of Greek aid. They went into Salonica at the invitation of Venizelos, though the latter went through the motions of a formal protest. And to-day, as the Paris rejoinder points out, the Allies are financing the Greek army.

Whatever King Constantine may say, therefore, cannot explain away the fact that if the Allies are in Greece to-day it is largely because, in the memorable appeal addressed by Venizelos to his King on January 11, 1915, words like these occur:

> On account of all these reasons I conclude that our participation in the struggle, under the above conditions, is absolutely imperative. Even if we fail, we shall preserve the esteem and friendship of powerful nations—those, indeed, who created Greece and so often since have helped and supported her. Our refusal to fulfil our obligations to our ally, Servia, would not only destroy our moral standing as a state, but would leave us without friends and destroy all trust in us in the future.

That was the sentiment of the Greek people a year ago. Under the influence of fear, sentiment may have somewhat changed. That it has not changed to 80 per cent. against the Allies is plain from many signs. In the recent Parliamentary elections the Venizelists abstained. As a result, the number of votes cast fell from a million and a quarter in the elections of the early part of the year to about a quarter of a million. Allow for difficulties arising from the mobilization, and it is still clear that an overwhelming majority of the Greek nation, by their very silence, only the other day proclaimed their adhesion to Venizelos and the Allies.

The German authorities appear to be anxious to make peace with somebody, if it be only Montenegro or Belgium. To the latter country a semi-official hint has just been given that she might get much better terms from Germany now than if she waits till the end of the war. But there is no evidence that the Belgians will respond to a suggestion of this kind. They have heroically faced a terrible fate, and are not of the mood to waver until the day of their deliverance dawns. They will be stiffened in their determination to hold out by the word just brought from Rome by a Belgian prelate. It is to the effect that the Pope will take no step to intervene in the hope of effecting peace until he is assured that the independence of Belgium will be completely restored. Upon any other terms the ending of the war would be unthinkable and disgraceful. We note with pleasure that the German Socialists are gaining a firmer tone on that subject, and are passing resolutions that there can be no satisfactory peace which does not put Belgium back where she was before the war. The Allies, unless they are crushed, must be of the same mind as Pope Benedict in insisting upon this as the one thing indispensable.

It requires a blinking of the history of immigration to enable an ex-President to address an Americanization Conference with a plea for imposing upon the country universal military service. If the history of immigration shows anything, it shows that one of the "promises of America" has always been freedom from the taxes, the drain upon time, the meddlesomeness, of general military training. Col. Roosevelt spoke in Philadelphia of what an "unspeakably foolish thing" it would be to refuse to pay heed to the German example in these matters. Yet large German immigration to America began at the time when Germans saw the striking contrast between Jacksonian democracy and the taxes, toil, and social hardships involved in the nascent militarism of certain of their states. "Military duty and the hard pressure upon the population," says Professor Faust in his history of the Germans in America, "had much to do with increasing the immigration." Government statistics show that in the years just following the Franco-Prussian War—good years for the German workingman—there were not less than 10,000 processes annually for evasion of military duty. That the facts are much the same for other Continental European countries is well known: thousands have constantly left them for a land free from the military system, and those thousands men of the best character and ideals.

George L. Record does not use the word "treason" in his hot blast against the Progressive National Committee. He merely states that "this country has never witnessed a more cynical and contemptible abandonment of principles by so-called leaders" than took place at the meeting of that body, at which the "whole 1912 programme of social and industrial justice was calmly kicked into the discard, and in lieu thereof the doctrine of extreme preparedness was elevated to the position of the cardinal principle of the party." With bitterness he declares that the fixing of the Progressive Convention at the same time and place as the Republican was "for the obvious purpose of enabling Perkins, the meal ticket and practically sole remnant of the party, to traffic with the Republican Old Guard for jobs." If this is not *lèse-majesté* and mutiny, what is it? The Progressive party was organized because of the crying need for proper leadership; nobody accused the rank and file of voters of any party of anything worse than stupidity. Now our last hope is gone. Yet not quite gone. "The sham battle will soon be over, and then will come the real conflict, which will create new parties and new leaders." *Das ewig Armageddon zieht uns hinan.*

Advocates of higher tariff protection used to point to whatever industrial distress existed, and assert, in Dolliver's words, that they "yearned for the factory bells calling millions back to work." Something more than a realization that the whole country is now prosperous and satisfied is accountable for the decline in protectionist talk. What it is was told the New York Republican Club by Jacob Schiff on Saturday, in words that have weight as coming from a man who has been for fifty years the stanchest of Republicans. He warned the party that "if you threaten the country and show it you want a renewal of special privilege and high protection, the people will have none of it. The people have learned; the workmen and farmers have learned, and they cannot be misled any longer." What must Penrose and Chauncey Depew think of this description

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of increases in the tariff as a renewal of special privilege? Penrose is of the view that Dalzell, of his State, used to take, that the wicked Trusts are really injured by that bulwark of legitimate business, a high tariff; Depew is still of the view of Sereno Payne, of his State, that every day of low tariff means an enormous loss of revenue to the Treasury, and another day of stagnation in industry. But the silence of most Republican leaders, the utterances of Republicans like Schiff, testify that the number of standpatters who refuse to learn in these changing times is decreasing.

Unanimity has long been the order of the day in the Supreme Court's decisions on fundamental issues; and it is anything but surprising that the decision sustaining the income-tax law should have been given without a dissenting voice. Even when the inclination to stretch the doctrine of "due process of law" to extreme lengths was far more prevalent than it is now, there would have been no standing-ground, among reasonable men, for its application to the requirements which this law imposes, as a supposedly necessary incident of tax-collection, upon employers and corporations; still less could the provision of the Constitution which declares that "all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States" be perverted into meaning that there cannot be progressive rates of income-tax or rates which distinguish between one class and another class of incomes. Both of these contentions are summarily, and even sharply, disposed of in the opinion handed down by Chief Justice White. "The Constitution," he says, "does not conflict with itself by conferring upon the one hand a taxing power and taking the same power away on the other by the limitations of the due process clause"; and as to the matter of uniformity, he states—what indeed is absolutely manifest—that it is only "geographical uniformity" that is prescribed by the Constitution and that there is not "a semblance of ground" for alleging any violation of such uniformity in the provisions of the bill. A notable feature of the opinion is the sweeping nature of its survey of all the objections, the effect of which must be a virtual termination of all attempts to break down this legislation, or any future income-tax legislation on the same lines, upon Constitutional grounds.

The idea that freedom of debate is no longer to be found in the House of Representatives fails to take one practice into account. The other day, the House had resolved itself into "a committee of the whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 406," the coal and oil leasing bill. The clerk read the measure by title, and the "further consideration" began. Representative Harrison, of Mississippi, opened the discussion, having forty minutes for his speech, and made a strong argument on the subject of exports of munitions. Representative Slayden followed with remarks on the Mexican situation. Mr. Quezon, the Philippine delegate, then replied to what he regarded as aspersions upon him by a member of the House in connection with the campaign for Philippine independence, and this matter was really debated by as many as three or four speakers. The discussion of the coal and oil leasing bill having progressed in this way for an hour and forty-four minutes, Representative Mays, of Utah, tried to sidetrack it by using up fifteen minutes in talking about coal and oil leasing. He was properly if quietly rebuked by the next speaker, Representative Helgeson, of North Dakota, who, with an hour before him, recalled the attention of the House to the subject before it by assailing Peary's claims to honors in exploring, and by Representative Bennet, who took up the phase of coal and oil leasing so prominent now—waterway legislation needed for New York harbor. This ended the time, three hours, allotted to general debate on the bill, the *Congressional Record* having been enriched to the extent of thirty-two columns.

The recent explosion on the United States submarine E-2 has been utilized by the American Association for Labor Legislation as an occasion for drawing attention to the inadequacy of the provisions of the Federal Compensation law for the relief of employees of the United States injured by accidents in the service of the Government, and of the dependents of those who are killed in such accidents. These provisions are pitifully meagre in comparison with those prescribed by the Workmen's Compensation act in force in the State of New York, and the Association urges that law as a model for Federal legislation. The contrast between this situation and that so glowingly depicted, only a few years ago, by the crusaders of the New Nationalism is nothing short of ludicrous. It was then constantly dinned into our ears that, what with the commercial or industrial rivalry among the States, the obscurantism of "fossilized judges," and the strangle-hold that "the interests" had upon State Legislatures, the only hope of progress in these matters was to be found in a strengthening of the central power at Washington, or the emasculation of judicial authority by means of the recall of decisions, or the enforcement of the popular will through the initiative and referendum. Here, however, in the State in which all those difficulties might well be regarded as at their maximum, we obtained in a very little while, and with amazingly little friction, a measure embodying the most liberal provisions existing anywhere in the world. This example has been followed by State after State; and now the very Federal Government which was supposed to be so infinitely better qualified to deal with the subject is urged to bring itself up to the standard of the benighted State of New York!

In signing an Executive order setting aside 2,000,000 acres of public land in south Arizona for the Papago Indians, President Wilson has provided a safeguard for a tribe which has too long suffered from white encroachments. Like their neighbors, the Pima Indians, the Papagos live in one of the most arid parts of the United States. Both American and Mexican ranchers have encroached on the lands of the two tribes and have appropriated waters that had been set aside for them. A year ago suit was brought to define and confirm the rights of the Pimas, who have their own reservation; what has been needed in the case of the 6,500 Papagos is the grant of a permanent home from the public domain. The Indians of the remote Southwest have too often received charity rather than justice, the Government intervening with temporary assistance whenever they fell into indigence. Indian Commissioner Sells visited the Papagos, and he returned last summer with a sense of the "pressing problems demanding administrative action for the tribes along the Colorado River," and a conviction that "their rapid advancement is assured with sympathetic coöperation."

Georgia's record of lynchings is fast lifting her to an unenviably high distinction. When just a year ago two negroes, father and son, were killed there by a mob too bloodthirsty to make sure of getting the real murderers, the State press spoke out emphatically. The Augusta *Chronicle* appealed to the people to put down "this growing spirit of mob domination," and called for "rewards large enough to bring every

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

member of this murderous mob to justice." The lynching of Leo Frank horrified the country. But it was followed by other lynchings, of negroes, till the total for the year 1915 had been brought up to fourteen. In the lynching of five negroes at Sylvester, Ga., on Thursday of last week, the man the mob chiefly suspected escaped, having been removed by the Sheriff; but the lynchers were determined to kill some one. Another perfunctory verdict by a coroner's jury, another empty grand-jury inquiry, will indeed show a "growing spirit of mob domination." On Friday, Bishop Walters, of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, addressed an open letter to the President petitioning for the appointment of some colored man to important Federal office as a test of the Senate's attitude towards the "political status" of the negro. The lynching in Georgia is a grim commentary upon the social and civil status of the black man in too many Southern communities.

A plan to retire the $346,000,000 of greenbacks, which are a survival of the irredeemable Government paper currency of the Civil War, has been submitted to the conference of governors of the Federal Reserve Banks by committees of the American Bankers' Association. Some of the reasons put forward in behalf of the step will not bear examination; the argument in favor of it should be based on permanent and fundamental grounds rather than on the immediate situation of this time, or on incidental consequences alleged to have followed from the existence of the greenbacks, the relevance, and in some instances the authenticity, of which is open to dispute. Thus an advocate of the plan is quoted as asserting that "it has cost the United States more than a billion dollars to maintain the status of the greenbacks as redeemable greenbacks." The reference is, of course, to the bond issues which, from time to time, were put out primarily for this purpose; but when we consider what was the actual, or ultimate, disposition of the proceeds of these issues, the assertion that they represented an expenditure of public money for the maintenance of the redeemability of the greenbacks falls to the ground. In indirect damage, the existence of the greenbacks has doubtless caused a loss to the nation of far more than a billion dollars; they are an anomalous element in our currency system, have been a source of acute danger in the past, and will present, so long as they are kept in existence, an invitation to demagogues and ignoramuses, at any time of trouble, to propose an increase of the volume of the currency by the simple process of printing additional greenbacks.

Suggestions like that of Robert Underwood Johnson for some one "of large means with the vision to make for himself an undying place as a patron of literature and art in a large way" are always vague as to how these patrons should work. The glib way in which headline writers speak of modern Mæcenases, de Medicis, and Oxfords betrays a greater vagueness in the public mind. The literary patron in the old sense has for two centuries been as dead as the feudal knight. The Orrerys and Queensburys took their leave of the literary world at the same time that the publishers, the Tonsons and Dodsleys, entered it as the real patrons. There have been no dedicatee-patrons or their like since the rise of a general sale of periodicals and books—since the time the middle classes of Europe added a wide interest in literature to that in politics and commerce. Benevolent patronage must now adjust itself as a supplement to the commercial laws of supply and demand which rule the literary world; and those who would see direct aid given to the young genius or the broken-down artist have never suggested a practicable method. Mr. Johnson suggests a special problem—the provision of assistance for distinguished men of mature age "in such straitened circumstances as not to be able to do their best work." But even this will have to be solved in some indirect way, and is probably being so solved. In universities, public institutions, various professions, the work of "foundations" is an increasing number of offices which can be thrown open to men of proved scholarship or literary ability, where they may honorably and easily provide for themselves.

Prof. C. Alphonso Smith's report on collecting and collating American survivals of British ballads contains some conclusions of more than scholarly interest. He has disproved Professor Kittredge's statement, in his introduction to the one-volume edition of Child, that ballad-singing "is a lost art"; for he has found seventy-six of the ballads in this volume surviving on the lips of American singers and speakers. The mutilations or substitutions of titles and words in American versions contain a whole social history. Thus the Virginia version of "Robin Hood Rescuing Will Stutley" states that Stutley "In Aiken prison lay," whereas the British form is, "And eke in prison lay"—showing that our variant harks back to the time when "eke" had the Chaucerian sound of "ache." In "Lord Randal" the oft-repeated "fain would lie down" becomes "fainting to lie down," showing that "fain" had become meaningless. American survivals, again, are less plain-spoken than their British origins. Ballads like "Little Musgrave and Lady Barnard" and "Our Goodman" either do not survive in America or are shorn of their offending features. Another characteristic is the omission of the supernatural, as not appealing to the matter-of-fact American temperament. As for geographical distribution, our Southern States boast the majority of the ballads, with New England in second place: Virginia had thirty-seven ballads, Kentucky twenty-four, Missouri twenty, and North Carolina nineteen. Professor Smith issues a warning: "That ballad-collecting, if done at all, must be done quickly, is shown by the increasing unwillingness of illiterate people to admit familiarity with these songs."

Professor Smith points regretfully to the fact that, while we have at least a specimen text for the 305 British ballads, ballad music has been wholly neglected. His search of British song books has revealed only about 20 of the 305 set to music. As America was settled when ballads were sung more widely than now, and before the words or music of many had been transcribed, he believes that we may fill a gap by collecting melodies and melodic variants. One musical compiler has taken down "from a group of colored children in the streets of New York" the first music known for the ballad "Sir Hugh," which narrates events happening in 1255. The colored children hailed from Virginia, and a touch of negro syncopation had been given an air brought over by early English immigrants. "Hame Cam' Our Gudeman" is sung by the negroes of Campbell County, Virginia, as "Hobble and Bobble." Campbell County has also supplied four melodies for "Barbara Allen," no two alike, any one of which may be as old as the known British and Scotch airs. It should inspire searchers to remember that what Pepys once lauded as "the little Scotch song of Barbary Allen," that music of "Johnny Armstrong's Last Goodnight" and "The Cruelty of Barbara Allen" with which Goldsmith said "our old dairy-maid sung me into tears," may survive to-day only in some ravine of the Great Smokies or farm-house of Missouri.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ON TAKING THE PROFIT OUT OF MUNITION-MAKING.

Scarcely a day passes in Washington without some new project for a Government monopoly in the manufacture of arms. Senator Cummins introduced a bill the other day for that purpose. Other schemes look to an export tax on the large profits of their manufacture. Through all the plans there plainly runs one idea. It is that private citizens ought not to be allowed to make money out of death-dealing implements. This feeling, as Professor Woolsey has pointed out, is not supposed to apply in times of peace. Then as many guns and shells can be made as one pleases, and sold to the home or a foreign Government at the biggest prices obtainable. It is only when we see the industries which we encourage in peace utilizing their product in war that we raise the cry about "blood-stained" profits. The scruple is a trifle belated. Moreover, if it did not show itself early enough to be entirely consistent, it does not now go to the length which is necessary—that is, necessary if we are to be logical and thoroughgoing in the demand that, as Senator Cummins puts it, war shall not be permitted to put money in the pocket of a "private maker" of the tools of war.

What the Senator from Iowa and people who think as he does have in mind is perfectly obvious. They have witnessed the rush of "war orders" in this country. Shops of all kinds have been converted into munitions-factories. New companies have been organized, old ones have increased their capitalization, and a great Wall Street speculation in war stocks has sprung up. All this has seemed to many persons a depressing and even disgusting sight, and we do not blame them. All that we ask of them is to be clear-headed and reasonably far-sighted, both as to what they dislike and denounce and as to the measures they would adopt to end it.

There is something quite engaging in the notion of stopping all private profit in the manufacture of ships and guns, armor and shells, powder and high explosives. But we must think the thing through. Where shall we draw the line in the process of making munitions of war? How far back shall we go in the demand that no individual citizen be allowed to coin money out of the miseries of war? All the plans published stop at the factory, at the company, at the completed product, at the munitions ready for delivery and use. But is it not evident that we must go back to the mine and the farm if we are really to get hold of war profits at their source? Every ton of ore, every carload of coal, every pound of chemicals used in the making of arms must also be denied its cent of profit on the way to the munitions-plant. Nay, if Senator Cummins were the severe logician he sets up to be, he would go to the Iowa farmers and call upon them to segregate every bushel of wheat, all beef-cattle, all the sheep and fruit and vegetables that they sell for the use of workers in factories where munitions of war are made. For all these products which could not be marketed so advantageously but for the rising demand caused by the war, and the industrial activity created by it, are just as truly "blood-soaked" as are the instruments of war which they help to make. When we set out to be righteous—we will not say Pharisaic—we must go the whole figure. We must lay judgment to the line and righteousness to the plummet. If it is wrong to make $1,000,000 on war contracts, so it is to make $1,000 in supplying the war-contractors. Guns and ammunition are no more "tainted" than are their constituent parts. If we lay it down that no private profit must be made out of munitions, we shall have to go back along the whole line and see to it also that the owners of iron and copper and lead and sulphur and nitrates and supplies of all sorts needed in the manufacture of arms renounce, or by law be estopped from, every penny of gain in their transactions.

On the whole subject there has been too much half-baked talk, in and out of Congress. That there are moral difficulties connected with it, we are far from denying. But that is one reason why they should be left mainly to the conscience of individuals. A few manufacturers in England, some in this country, have refused to make arms, on account of strong convictions against war. No one can fail to approve of such a stand, conscientiously taken. But when law-makers undertake to set up a moral standard for munitions-makers, we see into what confusion and inconsistencies they fall.

FLETCHER, GARDNER, AND THE NAVY

Before taking up the details of Admiral Fletcher's report on the condition of the navy in August of last year, it is well to consider the state of mind in which the average citizen will approach the reading of that document. To call it a state of apprehension is putting it mildly. A year of the Augustus P. Gardner school of naval criticism has created, or at least striven for, the following popular impression: that our navy has suffered rapid and serious degeneration; that the material—ships and guns—is poor; that the personnel is inadequate and inefficient; that the gunnery practice has fallen off to an alarming extent. In other words, putting aside the question of how large a fleet we should have, the fleet that we think we have is not there. Demands for a great army are based on the proposition, expressed or assumed, that our fleet will not come up to expectations, that it will fail to do its duty as the first line of our national defence.

Mr. Gardner and his disciples make a great display of statistics and technical argument. The plain citizen who has no access to Mr. Gardner's sources of information has been compelled either to accept Mr. Gardner's view of the state of the fleet or to fall back upon general considerations. These the *Nation* frequently stated. We have recalled in the first place that vehement criticisms of the Gardner type are always exaggerated for political or emotional effect; and in this connection we remember what Lord Charles Beresford had to say about the miserable plight of the British navy two years before the war broke out. In the second place, we have been moved to scrutinize Mr. Gardner's own figures. Only last week he announced that the latest coast-battery practice, official figures, showed an average of 37 per cent. of hits, and that the battleship practice of last spring, not official, but "given on my own responsibility," showed a miserable 8 per cent. of hits. And again this doubt has arisen: Why is it, when Mr. Gardner cites official figures, we get a very fair showing, and when he gives figures on his own responsibility, we get a deplorable showing?

We come now to Admiral Fletcher's report, and we turn first of all to the matter of target practice. The question whether our gunners can shoot or not is one that most readily appeals to the lay mind. Admiral Fletcher says:

> The scores recorded are higher than ever made before in the open sea.

And the New York *Sun*, in its article headed "A Rasping Indictment of our Naval Weakness," gives this in paraphrase:

> The scores show an increase in rapidity of fire as well as accuracy.

In other words, the common-sense of the plain citizen which assumes that fleets, like great business concerns and nations, are not often brought to the dogs in the short space of a year, is completely vindicated against the figures for target practice issued

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by Mr. Gardner's pontifical responsibility. As to the material condition of the fleet, Admiral Fletcher has this to say:

> In general, the material condition of the battleship squadrons is very good, both in hull and machinery.

The Admiral is not distributing whitewash. He proceeds to deal in minute detail with defects in material, enumerating six torpedo destroyers which are imperfect, pointing out serious faults in the submarines, and the like.

What, then, are the "rasping weaknesses" in our fleet? We take the *Sun's* own enumeration. Shortage of officers and men, lack of fast battle-cruisers, light cruisers, and aircraft; limitation of mobility of submarines; "lack of radio direction-finder," and too frequent overhaul of battleships. Some of these we may dismiss as too abstract for the lay mind. Important factors remain. The question is, however, whether these factors constitute a startling revelation to the public, of so serious a nature as to lead to the "suppression" of Admiral Fletcher's report. Of the shortage of men the Admiral spoke a year ago in a report that was not suppressed. Of our lack of battle-cruisers we have been aware. The battle-cruiser has come up since the battles of the Falkland Islands and Heligoland. We probably need battle-cruisers, but no one expected Secretary Daniels to pull battle-cruisers out of his sleeve within the space of a year. Our lack of naval aircraft is a real weakness.

Now, does Admiral Fletcher's report say that our fleet is bad, or does it simply point out how it can be made better? To us it seems to point all in the second direction. Take the shortage of men which Admiral Fletcher puts at five thousand. Is our fleet seriously undermanned? We turn to Hythe's Naval Annual for 1914. In that year Great Britain had in battleships and cruisers of all kinds 2,178,000 tons to our own 874,000 tons; our tonnage was 40 per cent. of Great Britain's. Hythe does not give the tonnage for the minor craft, but inasmuch as England had 238 destroyers to our 60, 70 torpedo-boats to our 21, and 96 submarines to our 50, it is plain that in total tonnage we were, if anything, a little less than 40 per cent. of Great Britain.

What was the strength of the British personnel in 1911? The total was 146,000. In this number are included more than 900 cadets and more than 7,000 boys in training; but pass these over. Also included are 18,235 marines, who with us constitute a separate force. Also included are 3,130 coast guards. These we subtract, and get 125,000 as the officers and men of his Majesty's fleet. In the same proportion, we, with 40 per cent. of England's tonnage, should have 49,000 men. Actually, we have more than 51,000. How, then, explain the fact that our Delaware has only thirty-five officers, as against fifty-three on the British Bellerophon? The only explanation is that this is not a criminal failure, but the result of a deliberate policy. For it is plain that the disparity proves too much. If this ratio of shortage held good for all our fleet we should be proportionately 50,000 men behind England, instead of being equal to her. If Admiral Fletcher wants five thousand men, the presumption is he wants them not to save our fleet from becoming a mere sham, but to make it a better fleet proportionately than England's.

We have not set out to argue that all is for the best with our fleet, and that we may sit back with our arms folded. But it is well to know what conditions really are when next Mr. Gardner assails our "phantom" navy.

EVERY MAN HIS OWN SPY

What we badly need, and at once, is a textbook on spycraft. In every other profession there are all sorts of guides and manuals. There are books on how to be a boy-scout and how to run a submarine, books on how to write novels, how to write short stories, how to write plays, how to write for vaudeville, how to write for the "movies." But the growing industry of espionage still awaits its theoretician, its Lindley Murray, its Ollendorff. This strange oversight by educational publishers we do not pretend to explain. All we know is that there would be an immense field for a textbook entitled "How to Be an International Spy." But there is no such book.

The material for it is plentiful. It keeps growing with the war, and before peace is signed it will attain dimensions that will compel the educationists to take up the matter. But then it will be too late, except for the next war. For the time being must the pedagogical possibilities of Dr. Karl Armgaard Graves remain undeveloped? It would be a pity, and a still greater pity if the same fate should happen to the "Revelations of an International Spy," by I. T. T. Lincoln, the young Hungarian Jew who first came to London at about the age of twenty, and at thirty was a member of Parliament after intermediate stages as itinerant missionary in Canada, Anglican curate in Kent, and private secretary to a big English cocoa manufacturer. His adventures as a prisoner of the Federal Government in this country are a matter of contemporary history.

On the basis of Mr. Lincoln's disclosures we feel justified in laying down the fundamental principles of the future textbook on "How to Write Diplomatic Revelations at Home." Rule No. 1 prescribes that the surest way of arousing interest and carrying conviction is to ask the reader as many questions as possible; or else to make a statement and ask some one in the audience to deny it. This is what Mr. Lincoln does:

> During the years 1905-8 instructions were given to all Continental correspondents of the London *Times* by Sir Valentine Chirol to suppress everything that might have a beneficial influence or effect on Anglo-German relations. Will the *Times* dare to deny it?
>
> Furthermore, who was responsible for the transfer of Sir Fairfax Cartwright from the Legation of Munich to the Embassy at Vienna, and what were the causes that inspired it?
>
> In 1906 Sir John French was given leave of absence on condition that he would go to France to learn French, which he did, for even then he was designated as the commander-in-chief of the expeditionary forces against Germany.

Observe the advantages of this method. A good many people may distinctly recall the London *Times* as being for years hostile to Germany. They are under the impression that there was no secret about it. But as soon as Mr. Lincoln asks the *Times* to deny the fact, the thing becomes a sinister revelation. A good many people might think that for a diplomat to be transferred from Munich to Vienna was a rather usual thing. But, hist! Why was it done? asks Mr. Lincoln; and you see at once there was some devilish plot on foot. Some people may recall seeing, the other day, a photograph showing Sir John French and Gen. Joffre in consultation through an interpreter. But this only proves that Sir John French was a very bad student when Sir Edward Grey sent him abroad to brush up his French conversation. Mr. Lincoln omits one interesting fact which should be included in his next edition. The man best fitted to lead the expeditionary force was not Sir John French at all, but a famous English commander, by the name of Higgsby-Scruggs, and Sir John French was chosen because his name *would naturally stir unbounded enthusiasm in France*, where, as those who are on the inside know, *the people speak French!*

A second requirement for success in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

authorship of spycraft is to exhibit a profound and accurate knowledge of contemporary politics. Thus Mr. Lincoln:

> Did they know at the time, or do they know it to-day, that Grey made use of the Congo agitation to force the abdication of King Leopold II of Belgium because Leopold would not be drawn into the orbit of the policy of the Entente Cordiale?

Now, most of us are under the impression that King Leopold did not abdicate, but died King of the Belgians. What the author probably has in mind is the transfer of the Congo from Leopold's personal rule to the sovereignty of Belgium. Still, it is as plain as a pikestaff that by giving up the Congo while remaining King of the Belgians, the late Leopold kept Belgium from being drawn into the conspiracy against Germany. Just how, we do not know; but then we are no international spy.

A study of Mr. Lincoln's book shows that the surest method is to ask questions. These are of three kinds. You may ask something everybody has always known; or ask something which may be true but is of no importance whatever; or ask something which would be astounding if true, and isn't true. As an example for the beginner in spycraft we may offer the following:

> On March 4, 1913, Woodrow Wilson became President of the United States. *Does Mr. Wilson deny this?*
>
> Will Mr. Wilson deny that on several occasions he has been observed in the act of taking grapefruit for breakfast?
>
> Will Mr. Wilson deny that more than once he was on the point of eschewing the Christian religion and embracing Buddhism?

The reader will note these questions with amazement, and after each one say, "Good heavens!" But that degree of success is precisely what the spy-author aims at.

THE TREND OF AMERICAN DEATH-RATES.

The preliminary statement issued by the Census Bureau on the principal causes of death in 1914, in the registration area of the United States, presents many facts of interest. Comparison is made in nearly every case with the corresponding rate for 1900; and one is brought face to face again with the now familiar contrast between the trend of the rate in the case of those diseases in which headway is being made through the progress of medical science and of general sanitation and those that do not belong to this category. That the death-rate from tuberculosis, which was 201.9 per 100,000 in 1900, had fallen to 146.8 per 100,000 in 1914, is not surprising, but is none the less gratifying. With the equally marked fall in the mortality due to pneumonia the public is less familiar. The death-rate from that disease was, however, 180.5 in 1900 and came down to 127.0 in 1914. The number of deaths from diphtheria has fallen by a still greater percentage of the figure for 1900, though not (of course) by so large an aggregate amount, the total from this cause having been, to begin with, less than one-fourth of that from either tuberculosis or pneumonia; the death-rate from diphtheria has been reduced to less than half—from 43.3 per 100,000 in 1900 to 17.9 in 1914. The same phenomenon is presented by typhoid, in which the rate fell from 35.9 to 15.9. The aggregate gain of human lives represented in the figures on these two pairs of diseases is no less than 155 per 100,000.

Over against the foregoing diseases must be placed those that have their origin in organic defects or deterioration, and that belong almost exclusively to middle and advanced life. In the same period of fourteen years which presents the advances just mentioned, there has been an increase of deaths from diseases of the heart, which have risen from 123.1 per 100,000 to 150.8; from Bright's disease and acute nephritis, for which the figures are 89 in 1900 and 102.4 in 1914; from cancer and other malignant tumors, for which the death-rate has risen from 63.0 to 79.4; from apoplexy, for which the figures are 67.5 and 77.7, respectively; and from diabetes, which showed a death-rate of 9.7 in 1900 and 16.2 in 1914. As regards cancer, the statement points out that "it is possible that at least a part of this indicated increase is due to more accurate diagnosis and greater care on the part of physicians in making reports to registration officials"; and, of course, it ought to be borne in mind that single years are not an entirely safe basis of comparison for the drawing of general inferences. But on the face of the figures, we have here an aggregate loss from five classes of disease belonging to the middle and later ages of life amounting to 74 per 100,000 as an offset to the gain of 155 per 100,000 above mentioned as shown by the figures for tuberculosis, pneumonia, diphtheria, and typhoid. A large addition to this gain is, of course, registered in the saving of infant lives, but the great strides made in that direction are familiar to everybody.

Whether the increase in the mortality from the diseases peculiar to middle and later life is to be ascribed to actual deterioration in conditions of life and habits of living or is to be explained as a mere statistical phenomenon having no such significance is a question of the acutest interest. A number of earnest and well-equipped inquirers, eager for the promotion of the public health, have unhesitatingly declared that such deterioration is proved by the statistics of mortality, and have even pointed to them as indicating an alarming state of things, as proof that the national vitality is being seriously and steadily lowered by modern industrial or social conditions. To this view we have never been able to subscribe. We are fully aware that it is based not on mere gross figures for the whole population, such as those we have just been citing, but on such increased percentages of mortality as have been shown *within* the age-groups in question. What is not, in our judgment, sufficiently taken into account is the influence of selection by survival; and the figures given above serve as a strong reminder of the force of this consideration. Is it not in the highest degree probable that among the 155 persons (in every 100,000) who, under the conditions of 1914, have been saved from the death which would have befallen them under the worse medical and sanitary conditions of 1900, there is a smaller proportion of the most robust type than among those who would have been able to survive in the face of those worse conditions? Until this kind of consideration is adequately taken into account, we see no reason for accepting any alarmist, or even unfavorable, inference from the figures.

One strong prima-facie argument has, indeed, been put forward in favor of a conclusion adverse to the American showing—namely, that in European countries there has been a decrease of the death-rate, not only in the age-groups below forty, but in those age-groups above forty in which the American figures show an increase. But there are two reasons why this argument is not at all conclusive. In the first place, it requires to be made far more distinctly quantitative before it can have any force; for, if the saving of lives in the earlier ages has as a natural consequence an increase of death-rates at higher ages, a close examination of the degree in which that process has affected our country, on the one hand, and the European countries, on the other, is necessary for the formation of any trustworthy judgment. And secondly, it must be remembered that the composition of our population has been changing through immigration in a degree the influence of which upon deaths from organic or constitutional dis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eases may be of itself sufficient to account for the apparent deterioration. Other considerations, less obvious, which we have brought forward in previous discussions, add greatly to the force of these; and on the whole we feel that it is not only by no means certain that vital conditions in this country have deteriorated, but that it is not at all improbable that a complete analysis of the figures, were that attainable, would show that they have distinctly improved.

THE PROFESSOR'S PLACE IN THE WORLD.

A year ago, the American Association of University Professors appointed a special committee of fifteen, to consider the subject of academic freedom and academic tenure. The report of this committee has now been made public. To say that it bears the marks of such careful and accurate thought as the importance of the subject deserves, and as the deliberateness of the committee's action implies, would be to do less than justice to this admirable document. So excellent is its presentation of every essential element in the case, not only in substance but also in form, that, were it possible to get the whole paper read by the general public, comment upon it would be superfluous. Wholly free from exaggeration and from professional one-sidedness, it presents with uncompromising clearness, and yet with all necessary qualifications, those principles upon the recognition of which depends the maintenance of an American professorate upon the plane on which it should stand; and it is hardly too much to say that in the compass of its twenty-two brief pages can be found a chart to which university authorities and outside critics may safely be referred for the resolution of any doubt concerning the proper status of the professor in his fundamental relations to the governing board of the university and to the community at large.

At the very foundation of the whole subject lies a proposition which ought to be axiomatic, but which, as the committee says, "is not yet so universally accepted as it should be in our American institutions." This is that, except in those few institutions which are content to be classed as mere proprietary establishments, the trustees of a university must be regarded as "trustees for the public." Rarely, indeed, would this proposition be explicitly denied. But it was precisely because it was not clearly and firmly apprehended that the University of Pennsylvania got itself into the sad mess of the Nearing case; and, on the other hand, it was the complete recognition of this principle that formed the crowning merit of the admirable new code of procedure by the adoption of which the trustees of that University not only wiped out the discredit attaching to that incident, but did a signal service to the universities of the whole country.

Closely connected with this elementary idea is the question of the nature of the professor's calling. The committee finds it desirable "to restate clearly the chief reasons, lying in the nature of the university teaching profession, why it is to the public interest that the professorial office should be one both of dignity and of independence." Foremost among these reasons it places the necessity of such a status for the professorate in order that there may be attracted into its ranks "men of the highest ability, of sound learning, and of strong and independent character." The attraction of high pecuniary returns is, and always will be, absent; nor is it, in the opinion of the committee, "desirable that men should be drawn into this profession by the magnitude of the economic rewards which it offers"; all the more needful, then, is it that "men of high gifts and character should be drawn into it by the assurance of an honorable and secure position, and of freedom to perform honestly and according to their own consciences the distinctive and important function which the nature of the profession lays upon them." In enforcing the point that the members of the faculty are "the appointees, but not in any proper sense the employees," of the trustees, the committee has hit upon a happy analogy:

> So far as the university teacher's independence of thought and utterance is concerned —though not in other regards—the relationship of professor to trustees may be compared to that between judges of the Federal courts and the Executive who appoints them. University teachers should be understood to be, with respect to the conclusions reached and expressed by them, no more subject to the control of the trustees, than are judges subject to the control of the President, with respect to their decisions.

Whether the institution be governed by trustees, representing primarily the wishes of wealthy founders and benefactors, and drawn largely from the same class, or whether it be a State university and therefore subject to the control of popular opinion, there is alike danger of a warping or suppression of the free play of disinterested scientific thought; a danger against which nothing can serve as protection except just such freedom of utterance for men of independent mind as is demanded by the principles set forth in this report, and provided for in the "practical proposals" with which it closes. That the assurance of this freedom should not be permitted to serve as a protection for the incompetent, the loud-mouthed, or the hare-brained is fully taken into account and provided for; what is demanded is not that such men should be retained in their posts, but that, before action is taken, their cases should be passed upon by men fitted to judge—in other words, by competent men of their own calling. "The existence of this Association," says the committee, in concluding its "General Declaration of Principles," "must be construed as a pledge, not only that the profession will earnestly guard those liberties without which it cannot rightly render its distinctive and indispensable service to society, but also that it will with equal earnestness seek to maintain such standards of professional character, and of scientific integrity and competency, as shall make it a fit instrument for that service." We congratulate the committee on the evidence which the quality of its report furnishes of the fitness of the American professorate to fulfil this high function.

Foreign Correspondence

SOME LESSONS OF THE WAR—DOING WITHOUT THINGS AND REALIZING THE OTHER PARTY'S MERITS.

By JAMES F. MUIRHEAD.

LONDON, January 1.

> What is war? A maniac's rattle
> At the ponderous gates of Truth.

These lines, from the Prize Poem of my senior year at Edinburgh University, written by Robert W. Barbour—the most gifted undergraduate of his time, doomed, alas, to all too short a career in the wider world—have been ringing in my head during these last days of 1915 (after an oblivion of dear knows how many years!), and have been leading me to ask what lessons we have been learning from this loudest and apparently most insensate of all the batterings at the portals of the eternal Why. Living, as it were, a whole generation in a single year, we are infallibly driven back to a questioning attitude both in our own consciousness and in the outer realm of institutions, conventions, and traditions. Above all, we have been awakened to the fact that there *is* something worth dying for. It seems, indeed, a strange anti-climax that we have been forced to acknowledge the glorious side of war; but unless we assert that war is truly nothing but "a maniac's rattle," and that the whole wide world is nothing but a vast lunatic asylum with neither nurses nor doctors, we are (I think) driven to this conclusion. For war seems to us now the only instrument by which we can save and perpetuate the blessings of peace. For it were better that a millstone were hanged round the neck of humanity

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that it were cast into the sea of annihilation than that the multitude should continue to exist as the slaves of the few, without honor, without security, without liberty, without responsibility.

We have found to our surprise that the plainer living imposed by the losses of the war is not by any means so great a hardship as we feared. We now realize that many of our supposed luxuries, some even of our presumed necessities, were so merely because we thought them so, or rather because our neighbors thought them so. We have discovered practically, what our sages have long tried to teach us, that a very large proportion of our expenditure has served no end of real comfort, but simply the lust of the eye and the pride of life. The simplest, easiest, and most comfortable mode of living is, on the whole, that of conformity with our environment; and now that we have all gone down a peg or two together, we really are scarcely aware that the general level has been lowered. It is astonishing how many things we can do without, without missing them—provided they are not rudely recalled to our consciousness by gloating possessors next door. On the more positive side we are equally astonished to find how quickly we become used to little actual discomforts that at first seem intolerable. Just as many of our gilded youth have had, in the trenches, to accommodate themselves to an intimate association with vermin, so we find it easy to ignore, in a high cause, numbers of little irritants that would once have raised intolerable blisters. Grumbling has almost wholly ceased. We are all so busy that we have no time to think of inconvenience. "Slackers" and "grousers" have become almost synonymous terms; and the group they cover is a very exiguous one.

One very general lesson we have learned is that the qualities most useful in peace are not necessarily the most useful in war, that the abnormal times cry aloud, first and foremost, for the man of adaptability. In the realm of politics and government, this has brought about a certain distrust of the "lawyer" type of statesman and a growing belief in the "business man." It is not without significance that, among our leaders, it is of such men as Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Runciman, and Lord Derby that we think with most complacency. If we add the name of Mr. Lloyd George, it is not because of his legal capacities (for he could hardly be called an "eminent" lawyer), but because of a certain impetuosity and vehemence, due perhaps to his Celtic blood, which may lead to occasional blunders, but does get things done. And by the lawyer type of statesman I do not mean the mere legal quibbler, whose aim is to make the worse appear the better reason and win a cause for which he has no conviction. I mean rather the forensic habit of mind which, before action, insists on the exhaustive examination of every pettiest detail, which is overweighted with precedent and legal lore, which (in spite of the well-known maxim) is apt to care too much *de minimis*. The average man in the street is pretty well convinced that legal processes are too cumbersome, too long-winded, too expensive. While willing, more or less, to overlook these defects in private matters and times of peace, where ultimate justice is more important than speedy relief, he is not willing to see the law's delays impede his steps in time of war, where repeated "adjournments" of the case cannot but be detrimental. When faced with fire, a man has not time to weigh the advantages of all the different varieties of extinguisher. The lawyer's eye cannot see the wood for the trees. The barrister may be able to present another man's case better than could the man himself, but the decision as to which case he will present is made for him. In politics, at any rate in war politics, we need the man who does not wait to be "briefed." We believe we have learned the lesson that prompt decision, even at the risk of mistake, is much more imperatively called for in our councils of state now than before the war. We have almost got to the stage of accepting "Jeddart Justice," which hangs a man first and tries him afterwards!

Each political party has become more open-eyed to the virtues of the others. Perhaps this process has inured more to the benefit of the Conservative party than of any other. It would ill beseem me to say that this is because war is a reversion to a more barbarous condition of society, in which the less sophisticated virtues have freer play. It remains true, however, that the autocratic system, with its clearly defined hierarchy of gentle and simple, fits in more naturally with the regimented panoply of war. The "gentleman," secure in pride of place and blood, and little tempted by pecuniary lures, was content in peace to lead the life of the sportsman. But when the call was made on him to take part in the greatest sport of all, he responded with simple-hearted devotion. The fulfilment of this duty satisfied the ambitions of the samurai. He had found his rôle. Another point that may be made in favor of the Conservative is the somewhat unexpected efficiency and usefulness, in this time of stress, of the House of Lords.

Though I have just spoken of war as the greatest sport of all, this must not obscure the fact that we have had to learn the lesson that this is more and more of a misnomer and that the playing fields of Eton are no longer in themselves an adequate nursery for our young officers. Brawn and courage, without brains, do not carry one far in modern warfare, and it is not the popular athlete who rises most rapidly. Of the forty or fifty youngsters of my acquaintance who have joined the army since August, 1914, the three who are already doing important staff-work (all Oxford men) were none of them especially prominent in athletics, either at school or at college; and this experience probably tallies with that of other observers. The same moral is taught by the innumerable promotions from the ranks of disciplined men who know their job.

A long letter might easily be devoted to what we have learned as to the power and the weakness of the newspaper press in time of war. As a whole, the press has been patriotic, though in some rather unlooked-for quarters patriotism has evidently been alloyed with desire of the dollar, the taste for sensation-mongering, and a distinct touch of megalomania. Still, in spite of the restrictions of the Censor, the influence of the press has been so conspicuous during the past year as fairly to justify its claim to be one of the Great Estates of the Realm.

Another very important lesson that can be but mentioned is the conviction that the imperial relations of the mother country and her colonies will be very considerably modified after the war. It will be impossible to treat children such as these in any way that does not recognize that they have emphatically attained to years of discretion.

FRANCE AND NEUTRAL SPAIN—KING, CARLISTS, CLERGY, AND REPUBLICANS.

By STODDARD DEWEY.

PARIS, January 8.

"I and the Republicans are with France!" is a smart newspaper saying attributed to the King of Spain, and doubtless false. King Alfonso may have an Austrian mother and an English wife and still be a constitutional King, which obliges him to remain neutral no matter which way his sympathies lead. It is true that the very idea of constitutional government has received as many shocks in this upsetting war as that of neutrality. International obligation has been made light of; why should national constitutions between King and people stand fast? The King of Greece has a Prussian wife, and all the American women I meet in Paris devoutly believe his *coup d'état* against the constitutional rights of the Greek Parliament was due to her intimidation. In Spain there is nothing of this.

Foreign Minister Villanueva has just given a significant communication to the press regarding the nomination of the new Spanish Ambassador at Paris:

"The distrust excited by the appointment of Marquis del Muni is not at all justified. In the present difficult circumstances, it is the duty of the Spanish Government to see that each Spanish Ambassador is *persona grata* for the government to which he is accredited. No doubt this particular appointment is a sure guarantee that our relations with the French Government will be very cordial. Such an attitude of cordiality is that which Spain desires to adopt towards all the belligerent nations. The distrust to which I allude might have a reason if the Marquis del Muni had been sent as Ambassador to Berlin. Although as a diplomat he has always observed strict neutrality, it is plain that his sympathies with France would suffice to give him a hostile reception in Germany—to the great detriment of Spanish interests."

This is a passing lesson in neutral diplomacy and, by the way, in the international legality which allows each Government to look out for its people's interests. Neither the French Government nor the French people have anything to say to this.

The attitude of the Spanish press and political parties, and particularly of the Spanish clergy, is a little different. Even with these there is a slow, but steady and sure, veering towards the cause of the Allies. Count Melgar, who was Don Carlos's man of confidence in Spain, writes now to explain why, contrary to the present spokesmen of his party, he, too, is for France. The Carlist pretender, Don Jaime, who had an English education, is silent, and is supposed to be bottled up somewhere in Austria. Although his party has not yet reached the final decadence of causes lost too long, they count for little in the present turmoil. Carlists in Spain, Bourbons and Bonapartists in France, Miguelists in Portugal, Jacobites in England are at different notches of the same descending scale—time has been against them all.

One of my early Spanish acquaintances had been a soldier with the first Don Carlos in the thirties of last century, when George Borrow went travelling in Spain. I knew him forty years later when the second Don Carlos

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had again begun fighting with his faithful Basque guerrillas in their mountains. He had the prestige of his young wife riding at his side, with the Cura of Santa Cruz leading in priest's gown and cavalry boots. It was a little more serious than Rory O'More—

He bold as the hawk and she soft as the dawn.

Its immediate effect was to set on the throne of Spain the father of the present King, Alfonso XII, whose mother, Queen Isabella, was rejected forever. Even in my time, city workmen had a song to say that Don Carlos should not come in her place:

Si la Reina de España muriera
Y Don Carlos llegase à reinar,
Corrieran arroyos de sangre
Por las calles de la Libertad!

If the Queen of Spain should die
And Don Carlos come to reign,
There'd be streams of blood a-running
In the streets of Liberty!

Well, the ways of Liberty have grown wider since then, in spite of the passive opposition of great landowners and rich townsmen. Twenty years later still a Barcelona anarchist told me, tossing his cape around his shoulders against the wintry wind with an hidalgo's pride: "You see, the difference between us and French anarchists is that they will have no one higher than themselves, while we will be as high as anybody."

The Spanish still prefer to dream of social levelling up instead of levelling down, but the fact remains that France represents Liberty to them. And that is why King Alfonso and Republicans—and practically all Progressives in any true sense—stand with France, now that war is made on her very existence.

It is even doubtful how far the clergy is united in its supposed sympathy with Germany. Here a prelate and there a friar give out fuliginous words against the French Revolution and the present Republic's suppression of religious communities. The Church and the world have drifted so far apart in their manner of speech that it is hard for each to know what the other means in real practice. Some have not forgotten the Kulturkampf which followed Germany's other triumph. And if, among the Spanish classics, there is a history of bluff King Harry and good Queen Bess making Catholics martyrs in England, there is also the equally classical St. Theresa who prayed unto fainting for the difficult salvation of German Lutherans. By outsiders, Spanish sermons and Spanish politics must be taken very much like castles in Spain.

This does not prevent other lessons in neutrality coming to France from Spain. A neutral country has the right, which nobody denies, to sell guns and groceries to all and sundry belligerents unless they are blockaded. For blockade-running with impunity is not yet an acknowledged neutral right. Also, neutrals have not the right to enlarge their own interests by furnishing military or naval bases to a belligerent.

Americans have lately noticed (it had been published for them some years ago in a French engineer's report to his Government) that, in the Danish West Indian island of St. Thomas, docks and waterways have been constructed with an expense in no wise answering to any Danish company's possible Panama needs. Now if Germany and the United States should go to war, it is clear that Washington could not allow Denmark to leave St. Thomas as a naval base for the Germans who have paid for the docks. In like wise, if Spain has been harboring and provisioning German submarines, France has the right to demand an explanation. Spain has already anticipated the demand by plumply denying the fact, although one of her three Islas Zafarinas off Mediterranean Morocco is under New Year's observation. As to the buying up of gold and copper and provisions in France by individuals acting from Spain and forwarding them through other neutral countries to Germany, why, the Allies can stop that only by the blockade of such transit trade, at the Swiss frontier or in ships for Rotterdam or Scandinavia. Many of these difficulties are the same as those found by the Allies in the trade of the United States. France has applied no other rule to them in the case of Spain. For particular relations between the two Governments, there is so far nothing to be brought before some future successor of ancient Hague tribunals.

In 1876 I crossed the North Sea in the cigar-shaped, rolling boat of a blithe English skipper, fresh from running supplies into creeks and channels of the Basque coast for fighting Carlists. It was the last days of what began as a revolution and ended as one more Pretender's failure. Perhaps this mighty war is tailing out likewise.

The First Americanist

By RICHARD DANA SKINNER.

The recent notable gathering of distinguished Latin-Americans in Washington for the Pan-American Scientific Congress naturally strengthens many historical memories. But among these memories, none, perhaps, deserves greater recognition and tribute than that of Don Manuel Torres, the first accredited Minister to the United States from the first southern republic of the New World.

It has been more or less our historical tradition to share with England the honor of calling into being the republics of South America, and even of instituting the rudiments of an American political system. But a little rummaging among old newspapers and documents is beginning to dull the lustre of even so famous an Americanist as Henry Clay. The fact is that our enthusiasm for the Republican ideals of the New World was the direct result not so much of our own insight and sympathy as of years of patient effort by the South Americans themselves. And of those southern Pan-Americanists, Manuel Torres easily commands the pre-eminent place in our history.

His death came in 1822, shortly after he had been received by the United States as the first Chargé d'Affaires from Colombia; yet the imprint of his idealism remains to-day. He was educated in the old school, under the guidance of an uncle who was at once Spanish viceroy and archbishop. It was to the education of this man that Torres attributed the formation of his own character and political principles. His only biographer, Col. William Duane, writing in the Philadelphia *Aurora,* comments pointedly on this phase of his life, saying that, singularly enough, as Torres had often told him, "it was to a Catholic archbishop and Spanish viceroy he owed all those principles which taught him to set the proper value on what is called nobility, and to love liberty and be a republican."

In 1796 Torres took up his residence in the United States, believing that in the centre of New-World republicanism he could best accomplish his life work, which, as Duane tells us, had for its object "the emancipation of South America and the formation of a *vast confederacy of free states* [italics mine], having a common character and reciprocal relations throughout the New World. . . . To him all the agents from all sections of South America resorted, as the *Franklin* of the southern world."

It is a matter of public record that fully two years before the issuance of the Monroe Doctrine, Torres wrote a most urgent letter to Secretary of State Adams, asking that measures be taken at once to establish an alliance of New-World republics to counterbalance the machinations of the Old-World monarchs. But his private influence surpassed even the official pressure he brought to bear. As a man he was loved, and as a statesman one might almost say extravagantly admired. When the United States finally accorded a tardy recognition to the South American republics in 1822, it was more than fitting that to Torres should have been granted one of the highest distinctions of the New World; but the honor arrived almost too late.

Says Duane: "The recognition of American independence by our Government imposed upon him a duty with which he conceived he could not, at any hazard, dispense. Being advised by a friend not to proceed to the seat of government in his enfeebled state, that it might endanger his life, 'Well,' said he, 'I have devoted thirty-five years to this object—I have lived for nothing else—and can I hesitate to consummate the last act that compensates all I have undergone?' 'But you may do your duty without hazarding life.' 'Well,' said he, playfully, 'if I go off, I shall do what men who have rendered great service to their country should do—defeat envy and prevent ingratitude by my *retirement.*'"

The funeral of this great Americanist, now almost forgotten in the greater glamour of Monroe, Clay, and Adams, was the occasion of a notable demonstration in Philadelphia. The fiery and affectionate Col. Duane describes the event in words which for that day were prophetic:

"There was much due, and much respect was paid," he writes, "to the great qualities and character of the individual—but it was the *great cause of all America* [italics mine], and the sympathy produced by the recency of the recognition of the Colombian republic, and the demise of a man whose devotion to that cause, whose profound views and wisdom had contributed so much to enlighten our own Government, and to strengthen the ties which had been formed by his sagacity and moderation, between the two sections of the New World, that operated to produce that generous concourse which was testified by the solemnity of the last service of his mortal separation."

The untimely death of Torres was a severe blow to the American cause; but in the enlightened coöperation of the New-World republics to-day, a coöperation of sentiment, of science, of education, and of political reciprocity, we are merely witnessing the fulfilment of his tireless work, and the triumph of a policy whose necessity and wisdom he understood very clearly, according to his own words, thirty-seven years before the famous declaration of Monroe.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Immediate Causes of the War

AN ATTEMPT AT AN HISTORICAL ESTIMATE BASED ON AN ANALYSIS OF SOURCES.

By EDWARD RAYMOND TURNER.

The difficulty of writing the history of the present results largely from the impossibility of procuring all the necessary information and the greater hazard of judging what is so close at hand. It is for this reason that most of the writing about the causes of the European conflict has dealt with the larger and remoter forces which led up to the disaster, rather than with the diplomacy and events immediately preceding. But during the past year or more so many papers have been published which the historical scholar may regard as primary sources, and so carefully have these sources been examined and criticised, that it seems to me possible now to reduce the results to a brief account which, if not authoritative, may be considered somewhat beyond the realm of opinion and conjecture.

The basic materials are the official publications of the Governments at war, first in importance being the British White Papers and the French Yellow Book. These documents, like those of the other Governments, reveal what their compilers desired to reveal and were willing to make known; but they are comprehensive and full, explain and corroborate each other for the most part in remarkable fashion, and to many critics seem characterized by genuineness and truth. The Austrian Red Book and the Russian Orange Paper are good, but wanting a great deal of information which the investigator expects to find in them. The German White Book is, so far as the documents go, brief and unsatisfactory in form, and apparently of such character as not to inspire great confidence. The Servian Blue Book and the Belgian Gray Paper throw light upon certain incidents, which is true also of statements issued by the Government of Italy. In a second class come a number of additional documents, such as the "telegram" published in the *Westminster Gazette* of August 1, and interviews and statements given out by the leaders on both sides. Finally, the sources and collateral information have been studied and digested in secondary accounts, many of which are hastily written and of little importance, though some are serious efforts to write a full and a fair account, the best in English being Headlam's "History of Twelve Days" and Stowell's "Diplomacy of the War of 1914."*

I.

June 28, 1914, the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, heir to the Hapsburg dominions, and his wife were assassinated at Sarajevo, capital of Bosnia. This fateful deed, which seems now so remote in the past, was to be followed by consequences which would mark off old Europe from new. But the first excitement and wrath in central Europe were followed by an awful hush and suspense. After a few days the world gave little heed, and supposed that if a crisis arose, it would pass as others had passed before it.

Europe had long been an armed camp, and was now dominated by two mighty groups of hostile Powers. Of all the sources of future woe the two greatest were the rivalry of Germany and England and the politics of the Near East. The Balkan question, most threatening of all, which had roused the spectre of conflict in 1908 and almost brought war in 1912, was ultimately the rivalry of Slavic and Teutonic interests, and directly the opposition of Austria and Russia. For some years the star of Austria was ascendant, but the events of the Balkan wars shattered the power of Turkey, an appendage of the Triple Alliance, and strengthened Servia, protégé of Russia and bitterest enemy of Austria in the Balkans. "According to the idea of the Russian statesmen," says the German White Book, "a new Balkan union under Russian patronage should be called into existence, headed no longer against Turkey . . . but against the existence of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy." And this is the key to the problem: stronger Servia, escaped from the tutelage of Austria, desiring to incorporate in her dominion Servian populations held under Hapsburg rule, and allowing her people to carry on a propaganda to bring this about, was a dangerous and troublesome neighbor. This Servia also was an obstacle directly in the path of those greater Teutonic ambitions which reached down towards Asia Minor and the Ægean. What satisfaction, therefore, would Austria ask now, or what vengeance would she exact? Some diplomats expected no grave trouble, but others gave warning. The Servian Minister at Vienna wrote: "The general conviction here is that for Austria-Hungary once again to take no action against Servia would be equivalent to suicide" (S. 31). The world has learned since that already, in 1913, Austria proposed to her allies action against Servia, which Italy, at any rate, did not support.

II.

Nearly a month later, July 23, an Austrian note was delivered at Belgrade, harsh, peremptory, and, except in name, an ultimatum. A reply was demanded in forty-eight hours. The contents of this note are well known now. Servia was accused of having failed to keep her agreement of 1909 to live on good terms with her neighbor, and it was stated that Servian officials were guilty of complicity in the crime of Sarajevo, though no proofs of this were appended. Austria, therefore, demanded the punishment of the criminals and the suppression of the conspiracies; but she went further and virtually required a change in the politics of Servia and control of the internal administration of the country, for she demanded that the Servian Government dismiss "all officers and functionaries guilty of propaganda against the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy whose names and deeds the Austro-Hungarian Government reserve to themselves the right of communicating," and that Belgrade accept the coöperation of Austrian police in suppressing the agitation in Servia (E. 4). Thus Europe saw its worst expectations realized. "I had never before," said Sir Edward Grey, "seen one state address to another independent state a document of so formidable a character" (E. 5.).

The explanation afterwards given was that Servia had exhausted all patience, that nothing but the utmost severity could curb the danger which she threatened to her neighbor, that the provisions most objected to were absolutely necessary to make the note effective, and that the peremptory character and the short time granted were to prevent delay and evasion, for which the Servian Government was notorious. But it has since been remembered that the note was presented suddenly when diplomats were away from Vienna and Berlin, when the heads of the French Government were returning from a visit to Petrograd, and when the Governments of the Triple Entente were shaken by internal disturbance and weakness. It was believed, said the Servian Minister, that Servia could easily be overrun. "It is believed also that such a war would be over before Europe could intervene" (S. 31). Apparently, Austria, long thinking herself threatened in vital interests, saw now excellent opportunity to deal with her enemy. The British Ambassador at Vienna telegraphed his opinion "that the Austro-Hungarian note was so drawn up as to make war inevitable" (E. 41).

Immediately there rose before Europe the dread prospect that such a war could not be confined to Austria and Servia. The German Government and also Teutonic advocates have not ceased to declare that here was a dispute concerning Servia and Austria alone, and that others who meddled in it must bear the blame for disasters which ensued. But because there was the almost certain danger that such entanglements would arise, the world condemns Austria and the nation who supported her.

III.

The first thing attempted by those who would avoid a great war was to prevent the outbreak of hostilities between Austria and Servia. England, France, and Russia at once made efforts to have extended the time-limit for the answer from Servia; but firmly Austria refused. Then British and French Ministers at Belgrade were instructed to influence the Government to return Austria as satisfactory a reply as possible. Doubtless a revolution would have broken out in Servia had there been complete surrender on all points; but the Prince Regent said: "We are prepared to accept those of the Austro-Hungarian conditions which are compatible with the position of an independent

*Among secondary accounts I must acknowledge my indebtedness to these authors in particular.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

state" (R. 6). July 25 reply was made. "The Servian Note . . . is entirely a play for time," says the German White Book. It yielded, however, some of what was required, and offered to submit to the Hague Tribunal or the mediation of the great Powers in case Austria should not be satisfied. Less than an hour afterward the Austrian Minister departed from Belgrade. When the news reached Vienna later in the evening, vast crowds paraded the streets in patriotic fervor and delight. July 28 war was declared.

IV.

And now appeared Russia and the beginning of an ominous train of events. July 27 the Czar telegraphed to Prince Alexander: "Your Highness may rest assured that Russia will in no case disinterest herself in the fate of Servia" (R. 40). The Russians considered their interests in the Balkans to be as great as those of Austria, and public opinion was strongly against the oppression of fellow-Slavs. During the crisis of the Balkan wars Sazonof, Minister for Foreign Affairs, had said that war with Russia must inevitably follow an attack on Servia. Already, on July 25, a momentous council of Ministers was held in the presence of the Czar, who is reported to have said: "We have stood this sort of thing for seven and a half years. This is enough." It was decided to mobilize thirteen army corps, to be used eventually against Austria, in case that Power brought to bear upon Servia military pressure. The order, it should be noticed, was not issued until three or four days later. A German writer has said that Russia was neither politically nor morally an ally of Servia; but the delicate balance of politics in the Balkans had long made it uncertain whether Austria or Russia would be allowed to intervene decisively to the disadvantage of the other; and although Austria now disclaimed any intention to destroy Servia or deprive her of territory, it was felt in Russia that if she were left to her fate, she must inevitably become a vassal and a dependent. "Russia," said M. Sazonof, "cannot remain indifferent" (R. 10).

V.

The history of this week is a record of attempts made to effect a compromise. By July 25 the situation was that Austria had broken off diplomatic relations with Servia, and Russia had let it be known that she would not be disinterested in Servia's fate. Meanwhile Germany had taken her stand by Austria's side: "We anxiously desire the localization of the conflict because every intercession of another Power on account of the various treaty-alliances would precipitate inconceivable consequences" (G. 1). If none of these three great Powers receded, then in case Servia was attacked, already a great war seemed inevitable. To prevent this calamity, two important plans were brought forward: one by Germany, to compel Russia to yield; the other by England, Italy, and Russia, that the differences of the opposing Powers should be settled by discussion or by friendly mediation of other Powers.

As soon as the note was presented to Servia, Sir Edward Grey proposed the plan of mediation by the Powers between Austria and Russia, with a conference at London to work for a satisfactory solution. In the opinion of one writer, this would have substituted the concert of Europe for two great hostile alliances, detaching for the time Germany from Austria and France from Russia. The proposal was at once accepted by Italy and by France. In so far as England, Italy, and France were acting in good faith, and it seems that they were, the result would depend upon Germany's action.

First the German Government objected to interfering between Austria and Servia: "It is impossible for us to place our ally in his dispute with Servia before a European tribunal" (G. 12). However, the Chancellor, von Bethmann-Hollweg, said: "We are prepared, in the event of an Austro-Russian controversy, while reserving our known duties as allies, to initiate mediation between Russia and Austria jointly with the other Powers" (G. 13). Sir Edward Grey had explained already that England was only concerned in the event of the dispute becoming one between Austria and Russia, and so affecting the peace of Europe. Von Jagow, Secretary of State, also declared that a conference "would practically amount to a court of arbitration and could not, in his opinion, be called together except at the request of Austria and Russia" (E. 43). According to the Russian chargé, "Jagow refused point-blank to accept this suggestion" (R. 39). July 28, the British proposal was declared to be only "a private and informal discussion to ascertain what suggestion could be made for a settlement" (E. 67); but the Chancellor replied that he could not accept this "because such a conference would in his opinion have had appearance of an 'Areopagus' consisting of two Powers of each group sitting in judgment upon the two remaining Powers." Austria's quarrel with Servia, he said, was purely an Austrian concern, with which Russia had nothing to do. But he desired to coöperate with England to avoid a general war (E. 71).

Meanwhile, July 26, Russia had attempted to enter into conversations with Austria directly. Two days later this was definitely refused, on the ground that Austria could permit no discussion on the basis of the Austrian note, and because it was too late, war having been already declared. It was during this same time that the German Government opposed mediation or conversations by the four Powers, on the ground that direct conversations between Austria and Russia were preferable. So nothing but failure came of these efforts to avoid the catastrophe.

VI.

It has been asserted that Germany and Austria desired peace and made efforts to preserve it. Doubtless they sincerely wanted peace, provided they could also attain their ends. Their efforts to accomplish a peaceful settlement, however, took another form from those of England. They attempted to compel Russia to withdraw her opposition, as had been the case in 1909; and the methods were isolation or intimidation. First, an attempt was made to have France associate herself with Germany to put pressure upon Russia, since the original dispute concerned only Austria and Servia, and because, according to the German Ambassador, "the prevention of war depends on the decision of Russia" (F. 56). It was desired that England and France should help to deter Russia from attempting to take part in the dispute, while Germany was unwilling to put effective pressure upon Austria to moderate her demands or submit the matter to European conversations. Neither England nor France would accept this suggestion. It has been said that by so doing they encouraged Russia, and are therefore responsible for the war which followed. There can be little doubt that had these Powers done what was requested, Russia would have yielded, and there would have been no war; but this would certainly have involved the destruction of the Dual Alliance and of the Triple Entente. It must be remembered that it was to uphold Austria as an effective ally that the German Government went to extremest lengths, as they themselves confessed.

At the same time Germany was dealing with Russia direct. Count Pourtalès, Ambassador at Petrograd, was instructed to tell the Russian Government: "Preparatory military measures by Russia will force us to counter-measures which must consist in mobilizing the army . . . mobilization means war." July 28 Austria declared war on Servia, and the next day Russia publicly ordered mobilization on the Austrian frontier. She had declared that she would not be indifferent to Servia's fate, but her protests had been unheeded. And so the Austro-Servian dispute had drifted into the danger of a conflict of Austria and Germany with Russia.

VII.

The Emperor of Germany himself attempted to mediate. July 28 he telegraphed to the Czar: "I shall use my entire influence to induce Austria-Hungary to obtain a frank and satisfactory understanding with Russia" (G. 20). Before this was received, the Czar had appealed to the Kaiser to do all that he could to restrain Austria. Shortly after the Czar sent his answer: "It would be right to give over the Austro-Servian problem to the Hague Conference." This telegram was ignored, and not published afterwards by the German Government. July 29 Russia gave public order for mobilization against Austria. The German Ambassador now informed M. Sazonof that his Government would mobilize if Russia did not cease her military preparations. That night came another telegram from the Emperor, that he still believed an understanding possible between Petrograd and Vienna, but that the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

military measures of Russia would accelerate calamity, and make it not feasible for him to mediate. "I am . . . of opinion that it is perfectly possible for Russia to remain a spectator in the Austro-Servian war without drawing Europe into the most terrible war it has ever seen" (G. 22). That is, if Russia would remain an unarmed spectator, Germany, ally of Austria, would mediate. The Czar had asked that she restrain her ally. Next day the Kaiser said: "The entire weight of decision now rests upon Your shoulders; You have to bear the responsibility for war or peace" (G. 23). July 31 he telegraphed once more that peace could still be preserved if Russia would discontinue her military preparations which menaced the central empires. Germany was now near to mobilizing, and the dread circle had almost been entered.

VIII.

During the latter part of this week further efforts were made to mediate, of which the history remains obscure. The German Government states that it continued attempts to induce Austria to come to an arrangement with Russia; but no evidence is furnished. July 29, Sir Edward Grey proposed, what was suggested by a German newspaper also next day, that Austria should not advance far into Servia, but should halt pending an effort of the Powers to mediate between Russia and herself. For this proposal the support of Germany was desired. Prince Lichnowsky, Ambassador in London, said that Germany would act upon this idea; and the proposal was communicated to Vienna, as the German White Book says, though in modified form, and apparently not recommended. July 29 also, at the suggestion of Germany, the Austrian Ambassador at Petrograd was authorized to enter into conversations with M. Sazonof. July 31, Russia undertook to maintain a "waiting attitude," if Austria would check the advance of her troops in Servian territory, and allow the great Powers to settle the matter (R. 67). Austria, now face to face with the terrific spectres which had been invoked, seemed to hesitate. July 31, Count Berchtold declared that Austria was prepared to accept the proposal of Sir Edward Grey "to negotiate between us and Servia" (A. 51). This telegram went as far as Berlin, but no farther, for next day Germany herself broke off negotiations and declared war. On this last day the Austrian Ambassador told M. Sazonof that his Government was willing to continue negotiations with Russia on the broadest possible basis (A. 56). At the end the tension appeared to be much less between Vienna and Petrograd than between Petrograd and Berlin; and it has been conjectured that Austria hesitated at the very brink of the chasm which she had approached, though this is not certain, for she had made no real concessions.

IX.

It would almost seem as though the war resulted from a fatal succession of mobilizations. When Servia was threatened by the Austrian note, she began to mobilize for defence, as did Austria with part of her forces to effect the fulfilment of her demands. Russia, unable to get Austria to submit the matter to discussion or mediation, mobilized against the Austrian frontier, from her own point of view, at any rate, in order that she might the better obtain a hearing. But it was, as the German Government has stated, a vital matter that her ally be preserved; and if now a great war arose, it would devolve upon Germany to save her. Germany, opposed by enemies on two fronts, has the advantage not only of interior position, but of superior speed in mobilization, against the greater numbers which her enemies can eventually bring to bear. Her military policy, then, must be to make their mobilization *casus belli*, and strike at once. At first, Germany seemed undecided whether to forbid partial mobilization by Russia, against Austria, but presently, urged on by Austria, began to threaten her even for this, which most probably had the effect of causing the scope of these measures to be broadened into mobilization also in the north. July 31, the state of danger of war was proclaimed in Germany, and Russia was required to stop every measure of mobilization in twelve hours. If this were not done, German mobilization would begin. On the evening of August 1 war was declared.

X.

The hour of fate was at hand for France. At the beginning of the crisis the French Government had been terribly handicapped by the fact that their leaders were absent on a visit to the northern courts. Therefore, comparatively speaking, France took a subordinate part in the diplomacy of the days following. I think there can be no doubt that France dreaded a war and desired peace and joined in every measure for settling the trouble; but throughout she was resolved to give loyal support to her ally. Hence she refused to put pressure upon Russia to follow the view of Berlin. July 31, she was asked what course she would take in case of war between Germany and Russia. Next day, in response to repeated inquiries, the Prime Minister told the German Ambassador that "France would do that which her interests dictated" (G. 27). August 3, Germany declared war, alleging that France had violated the neutrality of Belgium and committed acts of aggression on German territory. Similar pretexts were advanced to explain the declaration of war on Russia. In the latter case no evidence was advanced which it is possible to examine; in the former the evidence given has been discredited, and is probably false.

XI.

The position of England was peculiar. It was believed by many that conflict was looming up between Germany and England in the future, as the result of commercial rivalry and political ambition. But many others believed that such a struggle was not inevitable, and that relations would adjust themselves between the two countries with time and good-will. It had, however, come to be an axiom in British diplomacy that no great Power should be allowed to acquire the small kingdoms at the mouths of the Rhine and the Scheldt, and latterly that England could not permit the weakening or destruction of France, in whom she found against Germany her first bulwark of defence. But these were matters more clearly realized by statesmen than by the mass of the people, and at the beginning of the Austro-Servian dispute it was felt that no British interest was touched, and that England should by no means meddle with the controversy. I believe that England greatly hoped to avoid a war, and that Sir Edward Grey worked loyally and skilfully to accomplish this. Those who explain the events otherwise for the most part base their assertions not on what the documents say, but avowedly on what they do not say, and what they think they must mean.

From the beginning Sir Edward Grey realized, as did other statesmen, the grave danger that a quarrel between Austria and Servia would become a European dispute. "If the Austrian ultimatum to Servia did not lead to trouble between Austria and Russia I had no concern with it . . . but I was very apprehensive of the view Russia would take of the situation" (E. 11). Accordingly he hoped for mediation between Austria and Russia, or the settling of the dispute by European conversations. When these plans came to nothing, Great Britain was confronted with the prospect of war between Germany and Austria on the one side and France and Russia on the other. Her enemies have attempted to fix on her the blame, in that she did not withdraw absolutely from support of Russia and France; and perhaps she might thus have prevented the conflict nearly to the last; but only with the loss of her friends, the complete diplomatic triumph of the Teutonic Powers, and her own entire isolation in European politics. Also her allies were at one time disposed to affirm that she could have prevented the war by giving from the first her stanch and positive support to them, in which case Germany would not have gone further. This in itself is doubtful, and it must further be remembered that in England is parliamentary government, and that the leaders would most probably have failed to get united and cordial support from the people for such a policy.

July 29, von Bethmann-Hollweg asked the British Ambassador whether, in case of a general war, England would remain neutral, provided Germany undertook to make no territorial acquisitions at the expense of France. He could make no similar promise in respect of the French colonies. July 31, Sir Edward Grey told Prince Lichnowsky that if France became involved in war with Germany, England would be drawn in; but he also said that if France and Russia rejected "any reasonable proposal" put forward by Germany and Austria, then England would have nothing more to do with the consequences. Notwithstanding appeals

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from France that England speak out decisively now and make clear what her course would be, the British leaders, with public opinion divided and a division in the Cabinet, were unable to do more than watch and wait. Following a Cabinet meeting on August 2, however, Sir Edward Grey promised the French Ambassador that the British fleet would protect French shipping and coasts in the north. The promise was a consequence of military and naval dispositions which had resulted on the part of the two countries in connection with the Entente Cordiale. It has this great importance, that it would seem to mark England's virtual stand at last beside France in the war about to begin, since Germany without further declaration would most probably have regarded this as *casus belli* whenever it suited her to do so.

XII.

The actual participation of England in the conflict was brought about by the violation of the neutrality of Belgium. German advocates have declared this to be merely a pretext, and, although this is certainly not so, it is yet probable that the course of events and her friendship for France would have brought England in later on. Switzerland, Luxemburg, and Belgium formed a partial barrier of neutralized territory between Germany and France. The remaining stretch was strongly fortified on both sides. The plans of the German General Staff called for the rapid crushing of France, preparatory to turning on Russia, slow moving but mighty, and meeting her alone on more equal terms. This could best be done by striking right through Belgium and across the poorly defended French frontier in the north straight at the heart of France, before French mobilization was complete. But Belgium had been made a permanently neutral state by the treaty of 1839, of which Prussia was a guarantor. To the obligations of Prussia in this respect had succeeded the German Empire.

July 31, Sir Edward Grey asked both France and Germany whether they intended to respect the neutrality of Belgium in the event of war. France at once gave assurance that she would do so, but Germany refused to commit herself. August 2, the German Minister at Brussels, alleging that French forces were about to march upon Germany by the line of the Meuse, demanded that German troops be permitted to cross Belgium, and promised, if this were complied with, that the independence of the country would be maintained. Next day the King of the Belgians appealed to Great Britain for support. August 4, the British Ambassador in Berlin was instructed to ascertain whether Germany would observe the neutrality of Belgium; and at midnight, the assurance being refused, Great Britain declared war. In the last bitter moments the Chancellor said that England was going to war with a kindred nation just for the word neutrality, for a scrap of paper; but for England it was a matter both of national honor and of vital interest. In the Reichstag the Chancellor gave for Germany's action the true explanation: "Necessity knows no law . . . the wrong that we now do we will try to make good again as soon as our military ends have been reached." After the capture of Brussels the German Government published documents, and statements were based on them, to the effect that Belgium had justly forfeited immunity by herself violating her neutrality and becoming a partner of the Entente; but none of the documents put forward substantiate this, and the statements cannot be regarded as true.

XIII.

Italy, a member of the Triple Alliance, but with old-time hatred of Hapsburg power, had come gradually to be a bitter rival of Austria in the Balkans and in the Adriatic, at the same time that she was more vulnerable to attacks by the Triple Entente, and more friendly with France and with England. She was not consulted about the note to Belgrade. Since she had no desire for the aggrandizement of Austria in the Balkans, she gave no support to the measures against Servia; and since she had much to lose in a great European struggle, she strove to avert war, and shared in the efforts to preserve peace. July 28, the Marquis di San Giuliano, Minister for Foreign Affairs, suggested that Austria might explain to the Powers how her officials were to intervene in Servian affairs, whereupon the Powers should advise Servia to accept the note unconditionally. Italy desired also to act along with England in mediation between the other Powers more directly concerned in the dispute.

July 31, when efforts for mediation had failed, and war was about to begin, the Italian Government declared "that as the war undertaken by Austria was aggressive and did not fall within the purely defensive character of the Triple Alliance . . . Italy could not take part" (F. 124). That a member of the alliance should make such an assertion is justly regarded as the strongest of proofs that the war was brought about by the Teutonic Powers.

XIV.

England desired to avoid a European war, and Sir Edward Grey strove to have conversations rather than appeal to force, and attempted to bring about mediation and adjustment. England supported, though cautiously and with counsels of moderation, Russia and France, as was necessary for English interests and the preservation of the Triple Entente.

France dreaded war, and followed England in striving to avert it, but gave firm support to Russia, as was necessary for the maintenance of the Dual Alliance.

Apparently, Russia did what she could to avert war, short of yielding completely to the Germanic Powers and forfeiting her position in the Balkans. She desired adjustment or reference of the dispute to a European concert, but mobilized when her antagonists would listen to no compromise or real mediation. From the point of view of the Central Powers, this mobilization was the direct cause of the war.

Germany strove hard, in her own way, to avert war; but it was by attempting to impose her will upon Russia and to gain for Austria a free hand. In her foreign policy it was as necessary to support Austria as in the case of France it was to assist Russia; but she was more unyielding in regard to mediation and adjustment except on her own terms.

Austria had great grievances and had vital interests at stake; but she must be blamed for taking a measure which could only succeed in case she and her ally were able to intimidate their opponents, and which always involved a fearful chance of a general European war.

Apparently, behind the diplomatic scenes in Berlin and Vienna there was a military party more aggressive than the diplomats and less willing to compromise and wait, and this party brought the crisis straight to disaster. And there is reason to believe, though less certainly, that some of them regarded the present as more favorable for a decision than the future ever could be.

The direct cause of the war was the Austrian note to Servia; and the nations responsible are Germany and Austria, because of their unwillingness to compromise and confer. It has been asserted that, in the beginning, Austria acted without the concurrence of Germany; but it seems altogether improbable that she would have gone so far in the first place if she had not had from Germany ample assurance of support.

Notes from the Capital

PHILANDER C. KNOX.

Just what attraction a man like Philander Chase Knox can find in the United States Senate which should move him to seek election to it under present conditions, is a question no one in Washington seems able to answer. He has run so far through the gamut of high politics already that nothing but the Presidency remains for him to achieve, and he knows too much of American history to cherish any illusions regarding the Senate as a stepping-stone to the White House. Were President Wilson's term now beginning, instead of approaching its end, there might be something in the opportunity open to a Senator who had held two portfolios in Republican Cabinets to criticise, and thus possibly modify, the conduct of his successors in executive office, using his positive experimental knowledge of their problems as his lever. But the war upon the Trusts which Knox began with his prosecution of the Northern merger has about spent itself, and the system of "dollar diplomacy" which he launched and steered through the Taft Administration was promptly scuttled by President Wilson and his advisers; so, in returning to the Senate, he would find himself amid a wholly fresh environment in statecraft.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In reference to the magnitude of his mentality and his diminutive physical proportions, Knox is often called a "little great man"; but the most perfect epigrammatic description of him ever voiced was that of Theodore Roosevelt, who styled him "a sawed-off cherub." Though notably under the average height of sound and healthy men, there is not about him the slightest suggestion of insignificance. On the contrary, you have only to look straight into his clear blue eyes and round, well-balanced face to see that you are dealing with a man of no ordinary intellectual mould. When you have taken his measure in this way—and with his intellectual qualities I count his resourcefulness in sudden emergencies and his keenness in reading human nature—you have compassed about all you need to know of him. He has, besides an intellect, a heart; but he aims to keep it where it belongs, in strict subordination to his head; and so well has he trained it that, though always ready to respond to any deliberate call he makes upon it, it never is obtrusively in evidence, and certainly has a record clean of insurgency. When he does let it show itself, it challenges the surprise of whoever is permitted a glimpse of it. Once, when an eloquent woman called upon him for a small contribution to a local relief board in the midst of a trying winter, he handed her a check for so unexampled a sum that she begged him to instruct her as to how it was to be distributed.

"Use it, madam," was his answer, "wherever it will accomplish most. Doubtless some of your poor are worthy, and some unworthy; but, if all are equally cold or hungry, care for their present needs first, and do your sorting afterward."

Knox never carries any of this spirit into his law practice. There he believes in making everybody stand on his own deserts, and letting his necessities look out for themselves.

No one who was in Washington when Knox first came to town will forget his advent. McKinley had already tried two Attorneys-General. McKenna he had appointed for old association's sake, they having served in the House as colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee; and when Justice Field's retirement left the Supreme Court without a Pacific Coast member, he promoted his friend to fill the vacancy. Griggs cut more of a figure as Attorney-General, but was restless and uncomfortable under criticism, and sometimes was too peppery in his retorts to smaller men, in Congress and out, who made a target of him. What McKinley sought then was a man who was "all lawyer"; who, when he set out to do something professional, feared neither man nor devil, and from whom abuse dropped as harmlessly as water from the proverbial duck's back. There was one such, who, though he had not risen to any great prominence in public affairs, McKinley had been quietly watching for years. Knox was an undergraduate at a country college in Stark County, O., when McKinley was campaigning there for election as public prosecutor; and an important element in McKinley's success at the polls came from the solid vote of the Republican students whom Knox had organized for his support. McKinley had never forgotten this.

Knox, on entering the Cabinet, was at once assailed by the Democratic slangwhangers as being a thick-and-thin servant of the corporations; for proof, had he not helped to organize the Steel Trust, and was he not the paid attorney of the Pennsylvania Railroad? Instead of ranting and roaring back in kind, Knox simply smiled and remarked that he had not had anything to do with organizing the Steel Trust, and that, although he should much have appreciated a chance to look after the legal business of the Pennsylvania Railroad, he had never been asked to. There was nothing left for his assailants except to crawl back into their holes and keep quiet, and Knox's future in public affairs at the capital seemed pretty well insured against empty detraction.

There was no breach of friendship between Knox and Roosevelt, but it soon became evident that Knox did not find service under a non-lawyer President as agreeable as under his professional brother, McKinley, trained to the same point of view and modes of thought. Having worked so long at expounding the laws, he decided to try a turn at making them. His career as a Senator, Taft's unlawyerlike squirm through a makeshift opening in order to draw him back into the Cabinet, in contempt of a familiar Constitutional restriction, and his somewhat spectacular service as Secretary of State, are matters of too recent history to call for recounting here. If he returns to the Senate, it is safe to predict that he will concern himself most with the economic sequelæ of the European war, as related to the extension of American commerce with the outside world. TATTLER.

Correspondence

AFTER SEVENTEEN MONTHS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Nearly a year and a half ago, the sudden outburst of war in Europe, marked by the contemptuous trampling under foot of the neutral and independent state of Belgium, aroused throughout the civilized world one of the most hopeful moral reactions of all human history. The general tendency of modern civilization had been towards the elimination of war as a means of settling international difficulties, and towards the lessening of the horrors of war, so far as war itself should remain. But in the German military brain a backward current had been developing. Old-time visions had been dancing before ambitious eyes, and war had been again conjured into shape as a good and comely thing in itself, in case it could be made to contribute to national growth and glory. Diplomacy and arbitration might possibly secure justice in trivial matters of disagreement, but mere justice is not the food on which a superior race can rise to its desired position of dominance. The sword and not the scales is the proper implement for the superman in his mission of assigning to inferiors their due place of subordination. The inferior being logically the more cowardly, it followed that the sword should be so wielded as to frighten all opposition off the field as rapidly as possible, and hence that the idea of mitigating the horrors of war was all wrong. Make it as hideous as possible, spare not even women and children, strike the hospital or the home from the darkness of the midnight sky, and send innocent passengers into eternity by the hundreds by the torpedo lurking under the surface as the thug lurks in the bushes to commit outrage or murder upon the unsuspecting woman or man who passes by.

Such was the ugly eddy gathering at one side of the stream of civilization, like the sulphurous brew gathering in some old volcano; and as such it burst forth upon Europe in the summer of 1914. The outside world knew something of the writings of German militarists like von Bernhardi and von Treitschke, but it did not know that the poison had so deeply penetrated the entire German people. The sudden discovery that a great nation was ready to act on these hideous theories, to tear up its own solemn agreements and scout them as "scraps of paper" through the mouths of its own high officials, to fling international law to the winds, and set in its place the one standard of its own arbitrary will, could have but one result: the judgment and sympathy of the civilized world outside took its place at once and emphatically against a programme which meant nothing less than international anarchy. If Germany were to succeed on that basis, the right of a weaker nation to live, as against the ambition or ill will of the stronger, would no longer exist; nor could there be any real guarantee of the observance by the stronger of its own agreements. In every civilized land outside of Germany and Austria, the condemnation of the German position was the dominant public sentiment, freely and vigorously expressed. It thrilled the world as a strong moral tonic, and echoed back into Germany with a vigor that Berlin and Vienna found themselves utterly unable to comprehend. The best that they could do was either to allege an antecedent bias against Germany which every one knows did not exist, or to insult the whole world with the childish assertion that it was basing its judgment on "British lies." This has been followed by a desperate campaign to change the trend of neutral opinion—a campaign which in this country has involved the subsidizing of "newspapers" and magazines, the hiring of street "orators," the bringing over of the inept Herr Dernburg, and the prostitution of two embassies to a kind of work so utterly at variance with a decent regard for diplomatic usage and duty that it might well have resulted in a demand for the recall of both Ambassadors before the war was three months old. All this, and still the opinion of the great majority of Americans remains, that Germany was responsible for bringing on the war, that her aims in it are inadmissible, and that her methods of carrying it on have been lawless and inhuman.

This, I say, remains the opinion of the great majority; but there is a difference. The fine moral edge of American sentiment has been somewhat blunted with lapse of time, and we are in danger of falling into a moral lethargy which will allow us to "sit silent while base deeds are done." Already evil results of this moral lassitude are appearing. Pro-German influences in Washington are pushing measures to stop the sale of war munitions, and to refuse clearance to vessels of belligerents having American passengers on board. In other words, we are asked in the first case to take action which any man of sense knows would not merely be technically unneutral, but would be easily equivalent to putting a million men into the field on the side of Germany. In the second case, we are asked to take away from our own citizens, in the interests of Germany, the right to travel the seas in a manner wholly in accordance

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with every tradition of international law and custom, for fear, forsooth, if they presume to exercise that right, Germany will murder them on the high seas and thus embarrass our diplomatic relations with Berlin and Vienna! A more cowardly, traitorous proposal has never been introduced into the American Congress, and our voters will be sadly lacking in memory and spirit if any member who supports it, in either house, shall continue to betray our interests there any longer than the expiration of his present term. There is no future of respect for the Administration if it weakens for a moment in defence of the full right of every American citizen to travel the seas now and hereafter in any and every way that was nationally and internationally lawful for him before this war began, or the submarine was invented. I read in this morning's papers that the President is supposed to be coming over to the point of view that this right should be surrendered, in the interests of peace. I cannot for a moment believe it. I can conceive of no action within President Wilson's power which would be so likely to seat a Roosevelt in his place as that.

I cannot easily find grounds upon which to condemn the main points in the President's action during the early period of the war, as things then stood; but it does seem to many that results have shown some points at which a different course would have been better. An official statement, given out to every diplomatic office with which we maintain relations, and given out on the very day that the Belgian border was crossed, to the effect that the United States could not see without the gravest concern the violation in war of the territory of any neutral country protected by specific international agreement, would have cleared the moral atmosphere and would have placed President Wilson in command of moral forces which would be of immeasurable value to him in the present crisis of his Administration, but which are only too evidently not now at his disposal. It was a rather quixotic interpretation of the duties of neutrality as between Germany and the Allies that led him to shrink back from a formal protest against an act involving dangerously the whole structure of international law and comity. As a college man, I do not like to see so much justification given to the scoffers who allege that the schoolmaster is perforce too pedantic to be a statesman. Again, it seems to me to be overwhelmingly proved that we should have been wiser to stop peremptorily, at the outbreak of the war, every tendency on the part of Germany and Austria to abuse diplomatic privilege and precedent either to influence American opinion or to obtain military ends through action on American soil. It is not at all necessary that a diplomatic officer should violate American law in order to justify a demand for his recall. It is ours to say whether any diplomatic or consular officer is acceptable, and neither law nor sound policy demands that we should even specifically state the reasons why any particular individual is not so. The war was not six weeks old when it was quite evident that the efforts of the German and Austrian Embassies to combat the trend of public opinion through other than the regular diplomatic channels of communication were extremely offensive to a large share of our people. The offenders might reasonably have been sent home, and neither Germany nor Austria could have made any convincing objection. And if that had been done, the chances are good that the major portion of a long and dirty record of offences, ranging all the way from false passports to outrageous crimes against life and property, would never have been committed. I mean not only that a justifiable cleaning out of offensive diplomatic and consular officials would have cut connections vital to the transmission of funds and of directions for their use, but that such action would also have led offenders among our own undesirable citizens to give up the game, as likely to be dangerous. As things have actually developed, President Wilson's infinite patience with German offences has led offenders, even down to those of criminal rank, to suppose that almost anything could be done without serious danger. All down the line has existed the same confidence which has convinced Berlin and Vienna that there is no really vital peril in trying to break down British commerce by torpedoing vessels carrying American citizens.

Unfortunately, we have among us an element which has from the start condoned all the worst of Germany's offences. I have in mind a widely circulated newspaper, which, to the best of my knowledge and belief, has had no single editorial rebuke for the slaughter of American citizens, but has filled its columns scores of times with violent attacks upon England for interfering with American trade through her blockade regulations. With some of our people—happily the minority—the blood of an American citizen does not count as against a drop in the price of a bale of cotton! The paper in question was one of the chief clamorers for the note of protest which Secretary Lansing finally sent to London, and which won for President Wilson the compliment, doubtless valued at the White House at its full worth, of columns of praise in the press of Germany from the pen of Bernhard Dernburg. That our State Department should watch for British violations of American rights in the heat of conflict, and keep the record in shape for securing the proper redress in the proper way, is, of course, necessary and wise. *That it should so word a protest as to blur in the public mind the radical difference between the British and the German offences was both unnecessary and unwise.* The limits between contraband and non-contraband are not, never have been, and never can be, definitely fixed. The theory of contraband is universally admitted; the application must vary more or less with circumstances which cannot be foreseen. The right to employ the blockade as a means of war is also admitted, with the qualification that it must be "effective." Here, again, exact definition is in the nature of the case impossible, as conditions vary infinitely with the geographical factors of the situation. If England has offended in this case, it has not been at all from a ruthless disregard of our rights and a contempt for international law, but from going possibly a little too far in the "loose construction" of that law. And loose construction, whether in our own blockade operations during the Civil War or in our internal administration, has certainly never been considered a crime. England has gone to pains and expense never before paralleled in the history of warfare to protect American interests against loss through her blockade operations and her contraband orders, and in any case where she errs she stands ready to make the loss good when the claim shall have been proved through channels already existing. Under her blockade, our sea trade has rapidly reached an aggregate never before known. Such are her offences. Germany, on the other hand, has ruthlessly slain between one and two hundred American citizens, going lawfully about their business, all of them non-combatants, many of them women and children. This was no question whatever of even a possibly allowable extension of any existing principle of international law, but a flat, brutal, and defiant refusal to be held by the plain mandates of that law. Neither is it an offence for which any amount of money can ever render a just satisfaction. I repeat it, then, that a note to England so drawn as to blur in the public mind the radical distinction between the difficulties which we have had with the two countries was unnecessary and unwise. It played into the hands of Germany, as Herr Dernburg was so quick to realize, and it lost moral support to the President here at home. Furthermore, it gave encouragement to baleful influences which would be only too glad to break the cords of friendship that have made it possible for one hundred years to maintain an unfortified British-American border-line of more than three thousand miles. If any one wants an experience of real militarism, if any one would crush the life out of American prosperity and the hope of future peace out of the world for the next century, let him lend a hand to those who would disturb the friendly relations between the different branches of the English-speaking people. That there are those in Congress who would do this is evident enough, from bills that have been introduced and speeches that have been made since the opening of the session.

The deepest moral sentiment of the country, the same sentiment that came out so nobly at the opening of the war and on the sinking of the Lusitania, the sentiment that has thrown its millions of dollars down to feed starving Belgium, must rise to its task again and beat down the unpatriotic influences that are just now so active among us. And let it be added that, if the Wilson Administration is not to go down to ruin under the guns that are trained upon it now from so many directions, *it must get the bulk of this sentiment behind it.* We want a leader, and most of us do not want a Roosevelt. Still, we have seen all that we care to see of long-drawn-out haggling over American citizens slain that gets nowhere except to meaningless assurances, followed by more American citizens slain. We are getting terribly tired of excuses for diplomats who appeal over the head of our Government to the press, write letters suggesting the purchasing of American passports to get reservists through the British naval lines under false pretence, etc. We are very uneasy when we see the papers stating that perhaps the President will, after all, consent to a final settlement of the Lusitania murders on the basis of a mere money payment, and will agree to a surrender of the right to travel on the merchant vessels of a belligerent. All of these uncertainties are making it more and more possible every day that the country may conclude to try what it can do to relieve the present intolerable situation with the aid of Roosevelt, and trust to its ability to shake off afterwards the accretion of real militarism which might be taken on in the process. Neutrality in the European war, yes! But we are dealing with the relations

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Germany to ourselves, and to all other neutrals, now, not to her European opponents. And there is unquestionably a growing feeling that the Administration is not sufficiently awake to its duty to look after American rights, which in this case are moral and not commercial rights, and are of deepest interest to the whole future of civilization. I write these words as one by nature antagonistic to Theodore Roosevelt and his kind. If there is one thing under the sun which I should like above another in this matter, it is to see Woodrow Wilson place the moral power of his nature at the head of the moral forces of his country in this crisis.

W. H. JOHNSON.

Granville, O., January 8.

JEANNETTE L. GILDER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The sudden death on the evening of January 17 of Miss Jeannette L. Gilder leaves not only the world of letters, but the world of friendship, poorer.

Miss Gilder was a writer of long and varied experience. Beginning at the age of sixteen, for the fifty years thereafter she wrote newspaper "stories," magazine articles, books of facts and fiction, plays, and even a few poems. As she once said, she wrote not a little, but a great deal of everything.

It is scarcely necessary to characterize the material and method employed by Miss Gilder in her literary work; it is familiar to almost every one. The play of her wit, her enthusiastic praise of the persons and the things she found excellent, the scorn for those things—those persons, also—whom she found small or mean or dishonest: in increasing degree these were the distinguishing marks of her thought and feeling as expressed in writing.

If her experience as a writer was varied, so also was her experience as a friend. She liked many kinds of persons, and many kinds of persons liked her. Miss Sarah Orne Jewett once said of her: "She is 'Sense *and* Sensibility'; the usual person is 'Sense *or* Sensibility!'" Miss Gilder's friends invariably found this to be true. No one could equal her in performing an act of the most delicate and touching sentiment. One such comes vividly to the mind of the writer. At the time of the death of Miss Gilder's brother, Mr. Richard Watson Gilder, a friend and admirer of his was very ill. Several days before Mr. Gilder's death he had sent to this friend, by Miss Gilder's hand, a little bouquet of pink carnations. On the evening of the day of Mr. Gilder's funeral there came, from Miss Gilder, a similar bouquet; with it was Mr. Gilder's card, on which was written in Miss Gilder's handwriting, "From R. W. G." The flowers were from among those sent for the funeral.

No doubt the variety of Miss Gilder's interests and affiliations was due quite as much to her democratic spirit as to her fine sentiment and good-sense—or to a combination of the three. Wont to deride avowed philanthropy—even, when it took the form of organization, describing it as a "movement to badger the condition of the poor"—she was not only kind, but kindly. Men, women, and children of all ages, and of practically all conditions, liked and trusted her. Somewhat inclined to smile at Socialistic propaganda, she was as ready as the most consistent Socialist to share with others whatever she had. Her humanity made her able to share with them even her occasional amusement at their expense.

The writer, a reasonably good Socialist, happened to be in London once, together with another, even better, Socialist, and with Miss Gilder. One afternoon the three were invited to meet Prince Alexander of Battenburg, brother of the Queen of Spain and nephew of King Edward VII. The two Socialists were inclined to be somewhat conventional in their social behavior. For this reason, and for this reason alone, as they afterwards explained to Miss Gilder, they addressed the Prince as "Your Royal Highness." When the royal youth spoke of Spain, one of the Socialists ventured a question regarding "your Royal Highness's sister, the Queen of Spain," and the other hazarded an inquiry regarding "his Royal Highness, your Royal Highness's nephew, the Prince of the Asturias." Miss Gilder's eyes twinkled characteristically. She turned to the Prince. "By the way," she said, abruptly, "when are your uncle and aunt expected at Buckingham?" Throughout the remainder of the little "tea" the Prince had eyes and ears only for Miss Gilder.

Such a life as Miss Gilder's could scarcely have been lived without the aid of religion. Though she seldom discussed religious subjects, there was one significant expression of her religious feeling made by her. Shortly after the death of Mr. Richard Watson Gilder she wrote a poem, which she had printed and sent to her friends at Christmas. The poem was afterward published, but it may well be reprinted here:

MY CREED.

I do not fear to tread the path that those I love have long since trod;
I do not fear to pass the gates and stand before the living God.
In this world's fight I've done my part; if God be God He knows it well;
He will not turn His back on me and send me down to blackest hell
Because I have not prayed aloud and shouted in the market-place.
'Tis what we do, not what we say, that makes us worthy of His grace.

ELIZABETH MCCRACKEN.

Cambridge, Mass., January 21.

"UNFORTIFIED BRAINS."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Few letters recently printed in your columns have called forth more justified criticism than that by "X" on "A Bombardment of Unfortified Brains." The good of it is twofold. At home, many whom the shoe fitted have put it on. The answer made by the university student's paper to "X" rested its counter-argument on the assumed fact that in the East there were doubtless many persons who did not know where Muncie, Indiana, was, thereby expressing clearly the inference that such ignorance was on a par with the ignorance of those students who knew nothing about Gallipoli!

In the second place, many, throughout the land, have had driven home to them the deplorable fact of such undergraduate ignorance as "X" discovered; the sort which undergraduate "Y" (*Nation*, January 13) tells us the students of his acquaintance "cheerfully" grant

Here is my point, not of defence, but of comfort—the letter by "Y." It calls for the sort of rejoicing which is to be felt over the finding of the one sheep that is lost. It should greatly comfort faculty and students alike in that institution from which "X" and "Y" have written.

Z.

Book Notes and Byways

DISCOVERIES IN THE UNCOLLECTED POEMS OF EDGAR ALLAN POE.

By J. H. WHITTY.

The last collection of poems published by Edgar Allan Poe during his lifetime, in 1845, numbered thirty. With those not included in that selection, and new poems afterwards published, the poems in 1875 totalled forty-eight. One new poem was added that year. The collection remained almost unchanged for thirty-six years until 1911, when eight new poems were added, and two of his poems appearing among his prose were properly brought into his metrical works. Now three more new poems are added, making the collection stand with a total of sixty-two.

It is worthy of remark that a number of new and important Poe discoveries were made of late years after several reinvestigations among the Griswold Poe collection. The latest new Poe manuscript poem came to light after further investigation among the Ellis & Allan papers deposited in the Library of Congress at Washington. An account of some previous Poe discoveries among these same manuscripts was published in the *Nation* of July 18, 1912.

The new manuscript poem is without title by Poe, but is called "Life's Vital Stream" from the context. While this poem appears unmistakably written with a very bad quill, still the autograph is unquestionably Poe's. The poem follows:

Flow softly—gently—vital stream;
Ye crimson lifedrops, stay;
Indulge me with this pleasing dream
Thro' an eternal day.

See—see—my soul, her agony!
See how her eyeballs glare!
Those shrieks, delightful harmony,
Proclaim her deep despair.

Rise—rise—infernal spirits, rise,
Swift dart across her brain
Thou Horrow, with blood chilling cries,
Lead on thy hedious train.

O, feast my soul revenge is sweet
Louisa, take my scorn;—
Curs'd was the hour that saw us meet,
The hour when we were born.

There were also found in the same collection with this manuscript poem four other documents in Poe's handwriting. They were copies of an old English ballad called "Ally Croaker"; "Extracts from Byron's Dream"; "The Burial of Sir John Moore," and Goldsmith's "Song. From the Oratorio of the Captivity." Some of the handwriting on these closely approximates Poe's well-known later day autograph.

The manuscript of "The Burial of Sir John Moore" indicates that Poe may have intended this for some newspaper or magazine. He made a heading, "The Soldier's Burial," and wrote the following introduction:

"These verses have been often and justly admired as the only original essay on so hackney'd a subject as a Burial which has appeared for a long time—They are on the burial of Sir John Moore—Much dispute has arisen concerning the writer of this really elegant & original production, Moore, Campbell, Scott & Byron have all been mentioned as the supposed writer—It has since been pretty well ascertained to be Byron—As for the piece itself it is inimitable. The Poet, the Patriot, and the man of feeling breathes thro' the whole, and a strain of originality gives a zest to this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

little piece, which is seldom felt on the perusal of others of the same kind." This may stand as Poe's earliest known criticism.

It flavors strongly of a juvenile effort of his from the slip in attributing the poem to Byron, instead of to the Rev. Charles Wolf. All the evidence tends to show that Poe was employed in the warehouse of the old firm of Ellis & Allan at Richmond, Virginia, from about January until May, 1827, during which period all the above late-found documents are believed to have been written.

The two other new poems were discovered in an old leather-bound copy of *Graham's Magazine* for 1845-6, once owned by Mrs. Frances Sargent Osgood, the poetess of whom a romance with Poe is recorded. This copy of *Graham's* came from the library of Rufus Griswold, Poe's early biographer, and contains the autograph and markings of Mrs. Osgood. In the August number of that magazine, Mrs. Osgood has marked a short story of hers called "Ida Grey," which reads, especially with her markings, as if she had made Poe the hero of her tale. The descriptions in the story answer for Poe's, as well as other matters. An underscored paragraph reads: "He bids me tell him that I love him, as proudly as if he had a right, an unquestionable, an undoubted, a divine right to demand my love. Ah! with what grand and simple eloquence he writes." This might also correspond with some of Poe's other well-known romantic correspondence.

In response to her reference to the "divine right," Poe published in the October number of *Graham's* an impromptu poem entitled "The Divine Right of Kings," and signed it "P," which is made to read "E. A. Poe" by Mrs. Osgood. The poem follows:

The only king by right divine
Is Ellen King, and were she mine
I'd strive for liberty no more,
But hug the glorious chains I wore.

Her bosom is an ivory throne,
Where tyrant virtue reigns alone;
No subject vice dare interfere,
To check the power that governs here.

Oh! would she deign to rule my fate
I'd worship Kings with kingly state,
And hold this maxim all life long,
The King—*my* King—can do no wrong.

Mrs. Osgood used the pen name of "Ellen," and one of her children was called by the same name. She wrote verses for Poe's *Broadway Journal* at that period, to which Poe responded in verse, but towards the close of the year 1845 there seems to have grown some misunderstanding between them. In the December number of *Graham's* is a poem called "Stanzas," to which Mrs. Osgood has added in pencil, "To F. S. O."; also changing the end signature of "P" to read "E. A. Poe." The lines are supposed to have been sent to Mrs. Osgood by Poe to impress upon her the thoughts of a final parting; still he continued to write to her. The poem reads as follows:

Lady! I would that verse of mine
Could fling, all lavishly and free,
Prophetic tones from every line,
Of health, joy, peace, in store for thee.

Thine should be length of happy days,
Enduring joys and fleeting cares,
Virtue that challenge envy's praise,
By rivals loved, and mourned by heirs.

Thy life's free course should ever roam
Beyond this bounded earthly clime,
No billow breaking into foam
Upon the rock-girt shore of Time.

The gladness of a gentle heart,
Pure as the wishes breathed in prayer,
Which has in others' joys a part,
While in its own all others share.

The fullness of a cultured mind,
Stored with the wealth of bard and sage,
Which Error's glitter cannot blind,
Lustrous in youth, undimmed in age;

The grandeur of a guileless soul,
With wisdom, virtue, feeling fraught,
Gliding serenely to its goal,
Beneath the eternal sky of Thought:—

These should be thine, to guard and shield,
And this the life thy spirit live,
Blest with all bliss that earth can yield,
Bright with all hopes that Heaven can give.

In *Graham's* for February, 1846, Mrs. Osgood has some lines called "Caprice," which are answers to Poe's letter charging her with "Change, with every changing hour." It is believed, as Mrs. Osgood has written, that after this they never met again, although there seemed to remain a mutual feeling of tenderness between them until the end.

Among other recent Poe discoveries is a manuscript signed by Poe of a new version of his poem "To One in Paradise," which title he changed to "To One Departed"; as well as matters establishing a visit of Poe in Scotland.

(*Copyright, 1915, by J. H. Whitty.*)

Literature

DR. ABBOTT'S RECOLLECTIONS.

Reminiscences. By Lyman Abbott. With illustrations. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. $3.50 net.

Many were amused, a few years ago, to read the solemnly earnest passage in the autobiography of Senator George F. Hoar, in which he repelled the idea that he had ever been a partisan. And many will read with similar amusement the assertions of Dr. Abbott that he has always been careful to avoid that which would arouse opposition and controversy. In religious discussions, he tells us, he has constantly eschewed what has been called "the *patois* of Canaan," such terms as Plenary Inspiration, the Trinity, Vicarious Sacrifice, and Foreordination, battle-flags which at once challenge prejudice to the attack, and opposing prejudice as quickly to the defence. But both Dr. Abbott's life career and the pages of this volume unite to show that it is possible to put a controversial tang into language entirely apart from the belligerent air of individual terms. Only devoted followers who have allowed their habit of thought to be thoroughly moulded by Dr. Abbott's teachings will read these pages without frequent and sometimes sharp dissent.

To the logical mind, there is frequent source of irritation in Dr. Abbott's way of exalting into eternal and immutable principles demonstrably erroneous or misleading statements which happen to lend apparent support to whatever thesis he may be attempting to maintain. We are told more than once, with an air of crushing finality, that as in space an object can be moved from one point to another only by going through each individual point intervening, so in morals you can bring a man from one conviction to another only by carrying him successively through every intervening position. This sounds very good, so long as you leave it strictly in the domain of sound. Natural law in the spiritual world, the unity of the physical and the moral universe, and other such attractive ideas are immediately conjured up in the brain by its reverberations. But substitute sense for sound, and you realize that in accordance with this "fundamental principle" you can bring a man from belief in a lie to conviction of the truth which rests at the opposite pole only by convincing him successively of the "truth" of a countless series of gradually diminishing lies that cover the ground between. And then you perceive that the analogy of the body moving in space, with its rigid exclusion of qualification or exception, is wholly inapplicable, and that your universal principle must be whittled down to the mere commonplace that it is not best to be too abrupt in the attempt to reverse an average man's opinion by argument.

In other cases, Dr. Abbott's "fundamental principles" serve his particular purpose only by some peculiar twist of interpretation. We are told that it is axiomatic that "men who do not know how to govern themselves cannot know how to govern a great country." And this "principle" is used as an absolutely clinching argument against giving the ballot to the uneducated, particularly the negro, as if the governing of the country and the casting of the ballot by the individual were synonymous terms. There are, of course, strong arguments in favor of placing an educational restriction upon the ballot, properly intended, impartially enforced, and accompanied by all possible aid and encouragement towards its removal by those who fall under its provisions; but the opposite argument cannot be put out of court by any such "knock-down" method as the "axiom" quoted. Again, such Socialistic measures as commend themselves to Dr. Abbott are supported on the "principle" that "individualism is the characteristic of simple barbarism, not of republican civilization." If he were to lay aside his "principle" for a time and delve in the available evidence as to primitive human life, he might find it easier to make out a case for a rude form of Socialism than of individualism, as the more pronounced feature of "simple barbarism."

If the reader feels a tendency now and then to be driven to opposing conclusions by such flaws in Dr. Abbott's reasoning, he may at least cite a respectable precedent in justification; for the Doctor tells us that he himself was convinced of the freedom of the will by his early study of Jonathan Edwards, and that his rejection of the rationalistic philosophy was confirmed by reading the works of Herbert Spencer. Let him not be chagrined if many of his readers feel their sense of danger in the Philippine experiment enhanced by the fact that one who stands forth as a great moral leader can express the most unqualified delight in that policy, with no apparent recognition whatever of the evils which have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

already attached themselves to it; or if others are confirmed in their belief that the ballot should remain in the hands of the Southern negro by the fact that his hearty commendation of the suffrage amendments to some half-dozen Southern State Constitutions is qualified by no expression of regret that those amendments are without safeguard for impartial enforcement as between men of different color. A great moral leader, in discussing such matters before readers or hearers, many of whom will take his words as a kind of oracle, should be careful to think straight, to think comprehensively, and to think clear through. But Dr. Abbott specifically dissents from the theory that a man can rightly be held responsible for harmful results of words or actions which have no conscious bad motive behind them. Out of a lifelong feeling that he was treated unjustly by a teacher who punished him for carelessly breaking a valuable vase in putting on his overcoat, he erects the "principle" that conduct should never be measured by the consequences which flow from it, but only by the motives which inspire it. Years ago, near the reviewer's boyhood home, the pilot of an excursion steamer, through no other motive than good-natured compliance with a request, surrendered the wheel into untrained hands. A few minutes later the boat was in collision with another, and about half a hundred lives lost was the consequence. The pilot was convicted of crime and sent to the penitentiary. A rank injustice, according to Dr. Abbott's theory; a very hopeful recognition of the truth that a man can justly be held to criminal account for fatal results of mere carelessness, according to others. If the Doctor's theory were to be generally accepted, just as he states it and just as he illustrates it from his own boyhood experience, the way of the reckless automobile driver would henceforth be an easy one.

Dr. Abbott is far from being a humorist, and yet one finds here and there in his book a bit of unintended humor that is really delicious. For example, he attributes his success in editing the *Illustrated Christian Weekly* for five years without friction with its managing committee to the "mediating temperament" inherited from his father. "I have always been willing to yield upon questions of detail if I can have my way upon questions of prime importance." Some of the rest of us might easily develop grace enough to mediate on the principle, "Give me the big things that I really care for, and you may have what is left." Again, while yielding the highest honor to Dr. Abbott's tender affection for his wife, a woman of unusual ability and consummate wifely devotion, one can but smile at the unconscious humor of the statement, "She loyally supported my views, even when she did not share them, and we were *of one mind*." How natural is Dr. Abbott's opposition to woman's suffrage! Put into words, the argument lying implicitly beneath this statement would run somewhat as follows: The well-regulated man and wife are of one mind, even when they do not think alike, and that mind is the husband's. Therefore, it is sure of perfect expression if the husband does the voting. One may accept or reject the conclusion, but the logical neatness of the argument is bewitching, at any rate.

As preacher and editor, Dr. Abbott has had an active part in various movements which have aroused earnest controversy. One may not question his sincerity in the belief that he has avoided extremes in these matters, and yet his pages amply betray the controversialist's almost inevitable tendency to heighten the colors on both sides. His last three chapters describe movements which he designates, respectively, as an Industrial Revolution, a Political Revolution, and a Religious Revolution, all falling within the active period of his lifetime, and in all of which, with no undue assumption, he says that he had some share. There have, of course, been very marked industrial, political, and religious changes during the past half-century, but we are not living in a wholly different world, after all. There were many rays of light in all these fields long before Dr. Abbott was born, and we shall do well to recognize that there is darkness enough left to occupy the philanthropist for more than one-half century yet to come. Horace knew that there were many brave men before Agamemnon, and that there was at least one timid enough to drop his shield and run in his own day. We see contrasts between men and periods most easily, but if our reforms are to be lasting we must base them upon the deeper currents of human nature which do not change rapidly enough to admit of any really radical revolution within a single generation.

Dr. Abbott's volume is, of course, full of material of deep interest. There are few, if any, of the important phases of the life of his time with which he does not bring the reader into contact in one way or another, and nothing fills out the framework which we get from our formal histories better than the reminiscences of men who have seen the history of a period in its making. Not the least engaging are his recollections of conditions in the South at the close of the Civil War, when he was working there as Secretary of the Union Commission. The object of this Commission was broader than that of many of the societies organized among philanthropists of the North at the time, since it strove to relieve the desolation and impoverishment caused by the war wherever relief was needed, with no distinction of race or color, and Dr. Abbott, as secretary, strove to maintain the work on this broad basis, enlisting to the fullest possible extent the sympathetic coöperation of the Southerners themselves and taking every available step to heal the wounds which four years of warfare had inflicted. If we have not agreed with some of his later views concerning the negro, this does not detract from a sincere recognition of his wisely directed, self-sacrificing, and effective services towards repairing the ravages of the Civil War. And if one may not follow him in detail in his views concerning industrial reconstruction, it is only fair to recognize his unfailing support of such movements towards "social justice" as have presented credentials satisfactory not merely to the emotional philanthropist, but to the thoughtful as well. He explicitly disclaims sympathy with essential tenets of Socialism, and if some of his statements seem at first sight to contradict this disclaimer, the trouble lies in his failure to note carefully the possible implication of the terms which he uses. Still further, through all the latent possibilities of disagreement as to his religious views appears his unfailing concern that the religious tree shall prove its right to a standing-place by bearing "the peaceable fruits of righteousness." Dr. Abbott's pages record a long life of useful citizenship, and a stimulus to such citizenship is sure to be found in their perusal.

CURRENT FICTION.

The Strangers' Wedding. By W. L. George. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

A sore-hipped hippopotamus, greatly flustered,
Was grumbling at his poultice made of custard:
"Can't you put upon my hip
Something better than this flip?"
So they put upon his hip a pot o' mustard.
(Limericks of the Edwardo-Georgian transition period.)

Thus runs the motto of the first of the four parts into which the story is divided. It might have served for the whole book: but, then, it might be construed to fit almost anything in this imperfect world—for example, the imaginative literature of the "Edwardo-Georgian" period, which has given so much of its energy to experimenting with substitutes for the Victorian poultice. The young gentleman whose case, more narrowly, it poetizes, may fairly be called *the* Edwardo-Georgian hero. He is, in fact, that young Oxford man of refined tastes and ideals, feebly excitable mind, plentiful lack of common-sense, and rudimentary character, who comes upon London and there, with mincing elaboration, makes a fool of himself. Who cares? we are tempted to ask. Such a figure may well enough be painted for once, but why keep on? Roger Huncote and his ways are an old story.

He has dabbled in religion, among other things, at the university: "out of chaos had come no order, but rather a feeling half-optimistic, half-skeptical, that in the end heavenly mercy or revenge could take the hindmost." The only arms he possesses, to face the world with (besides a competency), are taste, manner and the social security it stands for, and a vague impulse towards altruism. The night of our meeting him is that of his first alcoholic and sexual debauch. This experience, with the corollary of an encounter with a dead man embracing a lamp-post in the early dawn, brings about a mystical union between himself and his kind. He sees that these things have happened in or-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

der "to wed him unto the people, to bring him close to them, to make their lives lighter, to fill his own. It was delicious; it was like a personal revelation." So he becomes worker in a Lay Settlement, and presently marries a young laundress he has met there. The laborious rest of the book amply shows how unhappy and impossible such a union may be. If Huncote were not a snob and an ass to begin with, and if his Sue were not a born dullard and vulgarian, the story of their relations might be more subtle, and therefore more interesting. But Mr. George is content to take the situation broadly, as it has so often been taken before. He produces his phial of oil and his phial of slightly colored water, and with vast enthusiasm demonstrates the undeniable fact that they will not really mix. Here, as in "The Second Blooming," he displays that amazing and complacent cleverness of workmanship which is the curse of his school. A certain figure flits across his pages—"one of the young novelists, one of the young novelists who marry respectably, but write an annual novel to induce other people to abandon civil service, sell potatoes on a barrow, and make illegal love to duchesses and cooks. A very tiring young man." Mr. George does not happen to believe in selling potatoes on a barrow; and he chances to prefer the physiology of marriage to the piquancies of "l'amour." He leaves the Huncotes no privacy: very well, they are his puppets. But readers must be granted some rights, if books are to be read. The marriage-chamber into which Mr. George and certain contemporaries insist upon crowding us is becoming close to the point of suffocation. Well, our oil and water duly refuse to mix. Sue cannot acquire an instinct for the right clothes or a liking for the right people. She cuts the knot by going off with her old cockney lover, Bert; and Huncote is left snivelling luxuriously in the arms of Theresa, the girl of his own class whom he should have married in the first place, and with whom we may safely leave him to his flaccid fate.

Steve Yeager. By William MacLeod Raine. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

In several respects this is better than the average Southwestern border story. The cowboy hero, though resourceful and mighty, is not invincible. Twice he is thoroughly beaten; once in a fist fight with an ex-prize-fighter, and once in an attempt to rescue the lovely heroine and her friends from the Mexican insurrectos into whose hands they have fallen. Of course, he wins in the end, but the victory is not entirely due to his single prowess. There is not much sentimentalizing about the heroine or the scenery—the two objects in regard to which most Southwestern romancers unpack their hearts with words. Mr. Raine accepts the beautiful heroine as a necessary evil; she is insipid, of course, but he does not obtrude her upon the reader any more than he has to. And he keeps the scenery in the background where it belongs. The black-browed villain, ex-prizefighter, is conventional; but he is made more plausible than usual, because he is the "heavy" in a moving-picture company. The Mexican villain, an insurrecto leader, is evidently studied from a lately vanquished chieftain. The author has handled his rather well-worn materials with a good deal of zest and narrative skill. There are plenty of thrills for the ingenuous, and even for the hardened novel-reader the book will while away an evening pleasantly enough.

The Dual Alliance. By Marjorie Benton Cooke. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co.

A play-writing, play-acting heroine with New York at her feet while Boston and the outlying regions wait to do obeisance, finds life not worth living, the father who had heretofore supplied her with heart-interest having inconsiderately died. Suicide seems her only possible relief, and she goes to her legal adviser to have her will drawn. The attorney—a tactful chap—suggests a hopeful alternative—to try life for six months more as his nominal wife and chum-at-will. The half-year includes a triumphant professional season for her, a carefree summer roughing it in Colorado, and a successful gubernatorial campaign for the legal adviser. In short, life together proves busy and exhilarating, and the weary child of fortune cheerfully consents to survive the end of the volume. All this is related with the utmost sprightliness and an engaging air of make-believe.

Jan: A Dog and a Romance. By A. J. Dawson. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Like Rudyard Kipling, the author of "Jan" is the champion of law and order. He is also a believer in heredity, so that when the Irish wolfhound Finn took for mate the bloodhound Lady Desdemona, their offspring, Jan, came by rights into a heritage of courage, fire, endurance, sweet temper, and good manners. But he needed more. He needed to know perfect obedience and the demands of unflinching discipline. So the author takes him out of the kennels of kind Major Carthwaite, of Sussex, and the spoiling of pretty Betty Murdock, his niece, and sends him overseas with Dick Vaughan, a clean-living, long-legged, rather stupid young Englishman, who, not having made good at home, goes to the Northwest and joins the R. N. W. Police. Incidentally—for this is really the story of a dog—Dick and Betty are sweethearts, and can only marry if Dick succeeds.

There are various ways of telling a dog story. One may take the way of supreme excellence and follow Dr. Brown, but "Rab" has friends, and much of the interest of that incomparable narration centres in human beings. And Alfred Ollivant is a master at such work, with his minute observation of nature, his etchings of sky and moor and cloudland, his painstaking record of dog habits, dog character; Kipling's dogs, like Ernest Seton Thompson's, are merely men in dogs' skin. But Mr. Dawson does not seem to have taken warning or counsel out of anybody's book, but has done his task off his own bat. Jan, once caressed and favored aristocrat, has hard experiences in the barracks of the R. N. W. P., and having made two enemies, meets the fate of Jack London's splendid mastiff and is sent to the far north as leader of a sled-team. It is all told with vigor and faithfulness and, if it is not true, indeed, my lord, you made me believe it. It is no small task to take an animal and, while making him the hero of a romance, avoid giving him the passions and ambitions of humanity, the rock upon which Alfred Ollivant splits, thrilling and exciting as are the personality and the Homeric fights of Red Wullie and Owd Bob. But Mr. Dawson never forgets that Jan is not man, but beast, and, though he is a gentleman, his virtues are those of blood and breeding and of untiring discipline. His loyalty is that of his *genre*, but his character is his own. The book is written in excellent style, illustrating the author's power to show pathetic tenderness and fine courage in few and simple words.

THE RED CROSS.

Under the Red Cross Flag at Home and Abroad. By Mabel T. Boardman. With a Preface by President Woodrow Wilson. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. $1.50 net.

It was estimated a number of years ago by Mr. Bicknell, the National Director of the Red Cross, that on an average five or six disasters of sufficient magnitude to require the assistance of the Red Cross would occur annually. This assistance is given when the operations of relief must be greater than the community can conduct, or when, though occurring in a wealthy and populous community, the event engages national sympathy. Mr. Bicknell's estimate proved conservative. Since 1905 more than seventy-five calamities—fires, floods, epidemics, mine explosions—have made demands upon the resources of the American Red Cross. It is chiefly as a picture of the multifarious, constant, and ever-growing labors of the organization in what may be called its civil activities that Miss Boardman has written her volume. She devotes most of her space to the history of its work in alleviating and repairing the effects of various disasters, in organizing campaigns against tuberculosis and other diseases, and in the improvement of general sanitation and the training of nurses. This is necessarily supplemented by an account of the organization and methods of the Red Cross. The American Red Cross has up to the present conflict done little in war; but the volume is completed by a brief survey of the work of the European Red Cross in international conflicts, and by an interesting but sketchy and journalistic description of the experiences of American medical squads recently sent to Europe under auspices of the Red Cross. Miss Board-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man's work, which is very badly organized, thus falls into three general divisions.

Those portions of the book which trace the history of the Red Cross in Europe, of the parallel relief movements in America till they merged, and of the International Red Cross since, are the most original and valuable. Not only has the career of the organization never before been well outlined, but little has been done in the way of those subsidiary histories which provide the best sources for a general account. Miss Clara Barton once published a volume of addresses and reports, and Miss Boardman has supplemented this by sources like L. B. Dock's "History of Nursing" and by American and foreign reports. The result is simply a popular narrative, which it is to be hoped will suggest the need for a full and accurate history. In her early pages Miss Boardman describes the work of Florence Nightingale in the Crimea and of Henri Dunant after Solferino, from their own writings; and she treats that of the American Sanitary Commission in the Civil War, which was organized in time to question the Union leaders at Bull Run, and which expended over $5,000,000 in the next four years. The excellent record of the Sanitary Commission had an important part in bringing about the signing of the Geneva or "Red Cross" treaty of 1864. An American representative attending the conference of twenty-five nations testified that the Commission had "long since met with and overcome the difficulties which some delegates were now predicting and recoiling before."

The extent of the Commission's work as a model for all Red Cross endeavor on the battlefield is, indeed, seldom realized. There was no like work of a national character carried on, and the efforts of the States were disjointed and ineffective. The Commission provided hospital trains and transports and moved over 500,000 wounded in the course of the war; it collected supplies for hospital and camp valued at over $15,000,000; it established soldiers' homes and convalescents' camps. Yet the adherence of our Government to the Red Cross agreement was long delayed through the determination of Seward and his successors to stick to the time-honored American policy of holding aloof from all European compacts of "a political nature." Not until 1881 did Miss Barton, through President Garfield, procure from Blaine the assurance that the adoption of the treaty would be urged upon the Senate. Upon the strength of this promise an American Association of the Red Cross was incorporated in Washington in 1881, and that same year began its work by sending money and clothing to those ruined by forest fires in Michigan.

In the Mississippi floods of the next twenty years, in the Johnstown flood, in Southern fever epidemics, and in the relief of reconcentrados in Cuba, the Red Cross slowly enlarged its activities. But Miss Boardman hardly shows how slow the process was, and she certainly does not indicate the many deficiencies of the body throughout this period. Nor is the active discontent within the Red Cross that culminated in its reincorporation by Congress in 1905 more than hinted at. In that year it received a new charter, providing that all accounts should be audited by the War Department, an annual report submitted to Congress by the Secretary of War, and the governing body —the Central Committee—reconstituted on wholly new lines. Two Presidents have since then been active, not honorary, heads, and the Red Cross has begun to cover its full field and reach its full development in efficiency. Miss Boardman tells in some detail of the work done after the San Francisco, the Cherry Mine, the Lake Taal, the Messina, and the Titanic disasters, and the Ohio River floods—work along the old line of the Red Cross's activity. But she does well to give greater space to the new activities which promise so much good because they enlist so much at once of public and private assistance. Since 1912 the Red Cross has had a special endowment of $100,000 to provide a town and country nursing service for coöperating rural communities. The American Red Cross is waging consistent warfare against tuberculosis and yellow fever at home, and against typhus, the pneumonic plague, and cholera abroad. Since 1907 it has expended $600,000 for relief of famine in China. Indeed, one of the noblest and most far-reaching of its services has been in awakening American philanthropy to opportunities in foreign fields. It has enlisted a large group of experts, public men, and men of wealth in the reduction of the Huai floods in China; it has induced others to check the plague in Manchuria; and it has inspired outsiders to assist victims of earthquake and maritime disasters and of the Armenian persecution. For expansion abroad it needs chiefly a heavy endowment fund, its present resources being far less than those of the European societies.

The remaining two divisions of the book may be briefly dismissed. The organization, methods, and spirit of the Red Cross are described in a haphazard way, in scattered paragraphs. The Central Committee governs the body through three subordinate committees—War, National Relief, and International Relief boards—organized in each State, and local chapters. Miss Boardman does not make it sufficiently clear that the vitality of the body must depend mainly upon the vigor and number of these local societies. The immediate goal of the Red Cross should be to enlist, as in Japan, members by the hundred thousand rather than the thousand. More credit, again, might have been given bodies like the Needlework Guild and the American Medical Association, which have appointed Red Cross committees to assist the medical bureau of the society. The chapters on the European war, finally, have in large part an interest that is factitious and evanescent. They are compiled from the diaries and letters of doctors and nurses sent abroad, from foreign newspapers, and from the official papers of the various Governments. They give an intimate if not always restrained account of scenes in hospitals, of first relief in the trenches, and of the assistance to refugees and to the people of ravaged territories.

ICONOCLAST AND IDOLATER.

On the Trail of Stevenson. By Clayton Hamilton. With Illustrations from Drawings by Walter Hale. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co. $3 net.

Some years ago there was a vogue for biographies directed at the romance-loving public, purporting to reveal the true character of our national heroes. The truth, as the authors saw it, turned out to be somewhat less illustrious than popular tradition had reported. One surmises that Mr. Clayton Hamilton has been ambitious of a similar revelation. The chorus of praise for Stevenson, especially the signal honor paid to the struggle and charm of his life, seem to have evoked in his bosom a recusant longing. The animus, to be sure, is disguised. The author starts out to linger wherever Stevenson sojourned, but after following him about the Continent, he loiters in Holland, where the traces are scarcely discernible, and even strays into Spain, where there never were any traces at all. Moreover, in America he abandons his high emprise when his object reaches the Appalachians. California days he summarizes at second hand, Samoa he leaves half a world away, and the Isle of Upolu he is content to hope he may some day glimpse arising from the sea. His is no sentimental journey, he announces in the opening pages, but one which will both illuminate the personality of the author and lay foundations for a judicious estimate of his work.

Now, in keeping with his private aim, the nearer intimacy thus acquired enables him to dispel the roseate mists of some cherished misconceptions. He finds that R. L. S. was not liked by every one at first sight. Andrew Lang picturesquely testifies to that. Nor did he love children. Mr. Edmund Gosse, the father of three children, avers that Louis could not make a baby smile. These discoveries are merely by the way. It is the heroism of Stevenson he most elaborately attenuates. The hero seldom had to earn a living, and when he did his work underwent an appreciable falling off in art, and his spirits, till then so buoyant, became tragically melancholy. What is more, he didn't earn a living even then. That is not all! The author feels that posterity has made a hero of Stevenson, "not because he always wrote well, but because he often wrote in bed." It was not hard to ascertain that "whenever he was well, he played and talked; whenever he was ill, he worked and wrote." Besides, even during the Bournemouth period, when he might have bled to death at any moment, his activity was never impeded by the intrusion of pain. Unwelcome as these opinions will be to the enthusiast, Mr. Hamilton affords the curious spectacle of presenting them with scarce

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

concealed satisfaction, yet with transparent concern to wound no sensibilities. Logical consistency should have brought to mind the sore straits of less honored American authors, the more trying struggle of Parkman, the more woful fortunes of Lanier, with the observation ever new that popular imagination does not nicely discriminate in setting up its idols.

The truth is that, in spite of these revelations, the author is himself among the idolaters. Stevenson as a writer is to him a perpetual counsel of perfection. The turn of his phrases reveals it on every page. He believes in writing badly for a score of years in order to write well in the end. He thinks that setting words craftily together is the acme of English style. But the top of Stevenson's performance is his descriptions, whose method Mr. Hamilton deems worthy "to be pondered deeply by all students of the craft of writing." In one of his early papers, to be sure, the youthful Stevenson declares that he allowed memory to choose out for his descriptions whatever was truly memorable. "If I make notes for future use, or if I am obliged to write letters during the course of my little excursion, I so interfere with the process that I can never again find out what is worthy of being preserved, or what should be given in full length, what in torso, or what merely in profile." This method, a kind of "emotion recollected in tranquillity" process, is not strictly individual. It is of necessity followed in essence by every writer of suggestive rather than splendid or opulent description. Furthermore, it is not quite certain that "for his selection of descriptive details he relied *always* on the subconscious artistry of memory." Stevenson concludes "An Inland Voyage" when he finds "nothing more in my notebook." And who does not recall the morning at the inn in Cheylard, where he was provided with a goad for the immortal Modestine? "Seeing me trying to write my journal on my knee, the eldest daughter let down a hinged table in the chimney corner for my convenience. Here I wrote, drank my chocolate, and finally ate an omelette before I left. The table was thick with dust; for, as they explained, it was not used except in winter weather. I had a clear look up the vent, through brown agglomerations of soot and blue vapor, to the sky; and whenever a handful of twigs was thrown on to the fire, my legs were scorched by the blaze." Evidently, these were no mere jottings. Should Mr. Hamilton, then, congratulate himself that in calling attention to this method he is placing the long-awaited keystone in the arch of Stevenson criticism?

Perhaps a word should be added concerning the illustrations. Mr. Walter Hale wields a cunning pencil. He sets before us the charm of many a scene upon which Stevenson gazed and of some which he loved. His sketches are good to look at. But concerning a few we involuntarily ask, "Que font-ils dans cette galère?" Antwerp and Marseilles are hardly mentioned in the text. To illustrate a passage in "Catriona"—the streets were "pretty brightly lighted and thronged with wild-like, outlandish characters"—we are presented with a view of the drowsy Maas with quaint sloop-like vessels dropping down with the tide. Curious, too, is the selection of St. Jacques at Compiègne, which Stevenson does not mention, in preference to the town hall, to which he returns with fanciful fondness. Of course, the answer is that of a holiday book you should not require that the illustrations illustrate.

A VERSE TRANSLATION OF DANTE.

The Divine Comedy. Translated by Henry Johnson. New Haven: Yale University Press. $2.50 net.

"A translator of the Divine Comedy," says Professor Johnson, "must receive his first impulse from within, and must continue to the end in a kind of solitude, looking to a reward that is ideal." But with the completion of a work so excellent as this, the long solitude changes into a rich and enduring companionship. To the student of Dante, whether novice or adept, this book will bring deeper devotion, and, in some measure, fuller intelligence. The rendering, faithful and vigorous, at once interprets; and its new emphases light up many a waiting facet of doctrine or of imagery.

Mr. Johnson's translation is, like Longfellow's, in line for line blank verse. The comparison thus inevitably suggested honors both men. Both seek, first of all, absolute fidelity to the poet's thought; and both, through patient scholarship, achieve. Longfellow strives, moreover, to reproduce with the utmost possible exactness the inner form of the original. He manages nearly always to equate line with line, and he retains to a remarkable degree, sometimes throughout whole sentences, the very order of the Italian words. But the resultant phrasing, admirable as a *tour de force*, is not infrequently obscure and somewhat foreign in its idiom.

For the will to be formally exact, Mr. Johnson substitutes the will to be clear; and his success in this respect affords the main distinction of his work. The phrasing, even in very difficult passages, satisfies the eye of the analytical mind—and the listening ear as well. For reading aloud, this version is better adapted, in the reviewer's opinion, than any previous verse translation of the Divine Comedy. In the classroom it carries the meaning directly and cogently; and it will yield memorable service among groups of friends.

For the sake of clearness, however, Mr. Johnson not only sets the phrase in normal English order, but transgresses frequently—though often by a single word—the announced plan of rendering line for line. The gain, on the whole, is greater than the loss, but there is a double loss. The proportion of run-on lines is much higher than in the original, so much higher as to alter perceptibly the progressive effect; and the particular character of the overrunning is unfortunate, for many lines are allowed to end with words that are properly proclitic—prepositions, conjunctions, and minor adverbs. Dante does not do this—nor Longfellow. Indeed, in general artistic quality, the new translation is not the equal of Longfellow's. The Muses breathe unevenly: here and there the rhythm is hardly to be traced; unintentional rhyme annoys too frequently; and the Saxon and Latin elements of the style seem often antagonistic.

These defects, however, are, after all, exceptional. The greater part of the task is well done; and there are many lines and tercets of notable beauty and power. Moreover, the workmanship rises when the content is most poetic, so that the finest passages are admirably rendered. Francesca's confession, for instance, the interview amid the burning tombs, the coming overseas to Purgatory, and the vision of the Cross in the fifth heaven are retold—worthily. We quote the first lines of the first passage:

And I began: "Poet, I fain would speak
With those two yonder, who go side by side,
And seem to be so light upon the wind."
And he to me: "Thou shalt observe when they
Draw near to us; then call them in the name
Of Love, that is their guide, and they will come."
Soon as the wind had bent their course toward us,
I lifted up my voice: "O weary souls,
Come speak with us, if it be not forbidden."
As doves, when summoned by their longing, fly
On open, steady wings to the sweet nest,
Borne onward through the air by their desire;
So left they then the throng where Dido was,
And came to us through the malignant air,
So powerful was my affection's call.

"O living creature, gracious and benign,
Who art now journeying through this dark air,
Visiting us who dyed the world blood-red,
Were now the Universal King our friend,
We would both pray to him to grant thee peace,
Because thou pitiest our wayward ill.
What pleases thee to hear, and what to speak,
That we will hear, and thereof speak to you,
While yet the wind is hushed for us, as now."

The book is printed neatly and accurately. It would be much improved, however, in a second edition, if each canto were to begin on a new page. Blank space at a canto's end would emphasize, as Dante liked to emphasize, the structure of the work; would suggest pause for reflection, and would give a welcome change to the eye—printer's prejudice notwithstanding. The crowding of an initial tercet at the foot of a page looks economical in the extreme. The white and blue cover, on the contrary, is not economical, and is not appropriate for Dante's sort of poetry.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes

E. P. Dutton & Co. will publish shortly "Ocean Sleuth," by Maurice Drake; "The Appeal of the Picture," by F. C. Tilney; "Venizelos," by C. Korofilos, and Theodore Watts-Dunton's "Old Familiar Faces."

George, Allen & Unwin, London, announce for immediate publication "The Coming Scrap of Paper," by Edward W. Edsall; "The Curse of the Hohenzollern," by Charles Sarolea, and a translation by A. O'D. Bartholeyns of Silvio Pellico's tragedy, "Francesca da Rimini."

The following publications are announced as forthcoming by Little, Brown & Co.: "The Monroe Doctrine: An interpretation," by Albert Bushnell Hart; "Held to Answer," by Peter Clark Macfarlane; "Mildew Manse," by Belle K. Maniates; "The Spirit of France," by Owen Johnson. The same house announces that it has taken over the American publication of Granville Barker's works and will reissue shortly in separate volumes "The Marrying of Anne Leete," "The Voysey Inheritance," and "Waste."

The matter of Frederic Rowland Marvin's "Fireside Papers" (Sherman, French; $1.50 net) is always curious, always vagrant, and always, considering his themes, a little bookish. The volume responds to a rambling mood, and to a taste for quaint bits of information; but it has little of consistent texture. A good essay, according to Richard Middleton's definition, should have the apparent aimlessness of life and, like life, its secret purpose; Mr. Marvin's have a brave overt purposefulness, but it is all sham—his themes lose themselves in sand and shallows. Several of his topics, indeed, preclude any real unity; "Death from Unusual Causes," "Human Derelicts," "The Loneliness of Genius," resolve themselves into strings of anecdotes, while even "Minor Poets" is not a discussion of the characteristics and merits of minor poetry, but a chain of miniature biographical sketches. If there are those who wish to possess a book which discusses the statistics of coffee and tea drinkers, Sappho, the propriety of electrocuting criminals, the melancholy of Chopin, the work of John G. Percival and Phyllis Wheatley, Cæsar Borgia's use of poisoned rings, the Oneida Community, John Alexander Dowie's points of resemblance to Swedenborg, and the future life of beasts, Mr. Marvin's will exactly suit their purpose. Nothing short of an almanac offers so much miscellaneous information with so frequent change of subject. In justice to Mr. Marvin, it is to be said that both his style and point of view have mellowness, and that two essays, "Maupassant and Poe" and "Philosophers and Patriotism," exhibit some little sustained critical thought.

Mr. Dudley Foulke's "Some Love Songs of Petrarch" (Oxford University Press) contains translations of about seventy poems, prefaced by a long biography and followed by three appendices. The translations are in verse, but they do not retain exactly the Italian forms. The Petrarchan sonnet is replaced by the Shakespearean—very different in effect—and the *canzone* stanza is remodelled at will. The English versions, though creditably accurate and in a few cases very successful, suffer from reluctant rhyme, and miss the delicacy and elegance of the original.

> Colei che sola a me par donna

becomes, for instance, through need of a rhyme for "waters,"

> She who seems to me
> The only one among earth's daughters;

and the gentle

> Volga la vista dislosa e lieta,

later in the same poem, is rendered

> And turn her gaze with longing, nay with glee.

The prefatory Life follows in the main Miss Jerrold's excellent narrative; but when this guide deserts him, Mr. Foulke is apt to go astray. The whole book, indeed—particularly the appendix on the identity of Laura—reveals a deplorable ignorance of recent Petrarch scholarship.

The J. B. Lippincott Co. has recently issued, in two well-made volumes, a work whose title reads simply "The History of the Harlequinade, by Maurice Sand" ($6). There is no preface. Nor does the publisher's ready-made "Editorial Comment" give any indication that this "distinct addition to the literature of the theatre" is not brand new, or that "Maurice Sand" does not rhyme with "happy land." As a matter of fact, the work is a translation of "Masques et Bouffons," published at Paris in 1860 with a perfunctory preface by George Sand, and a delightful *avant-propos* by Maurice, her son, in which he tells of certain amateur experiments in improvised comedy in the years 1846-1848. The translation is excellent—except for the title (the "Editorial Comment" tells us that "the author uses the term Harlequinade in lieu of a better"). The long introduction, in which the career of the masks is traced from 800 B. C. to the Renaissance, is (though the "Editorial Comment" assures us that Pantaloon comes "all the way from the wheezy satyr besmeared with grape juice down to Cassandra besmeared with snuff at the hands of Aristophanes, Plautus, Terence, Macchiavelli, Beolco, and Molière") a tissue of absurdities, and was long since recognized as such by students of the drama. The body of the work, however, which deals with the leading figures of the *Commedia dell' arte* in Italy and France, is still valuable as a storehouse of curious information and amusing anecdote. The French edition was admirably illustrated with many engravings showing the costumes of the stock characters at various times. Sixteen of these engravings are reproduced in Lippincott's edition, and are very neatly hand-colored (in accordance with directions given in M. Sand's appendices). It is a pity that the dates were not retained for these figures—and that these do not always bear the right names.

The indefatigable Mr. Joseph McCabe has written a book on "The Kaiser, His Personality and Career" (London: T. Fisher Unwin; 5s. net). Though not as good as his "Soul of Europe" (recently reviewed in the *Nation*), Mr. McCabe's latest production commends itself to the reader by a skilful selection of the salient facts and a facile, clear, if somewhat journalistic, style. With his usual industry the author has examined carefully the various authorities on his subject, apparently relying for the interpretation of facts chiefly on Count Reventlow's "Deutschlands auswärtige Politik" and Dr. Paul Liman's trenchant critical biography, "Der Kaiser." According to him the three fundamental characteristics of William II are fierce will, an untiring energy, and a prolific and romantic imagination. He grants him a certain early idealism, marred, however, even at the outset, as he hastens to assure us, by abnormal conceit, unfilial conduct, and an incipient disposition for intrigue and diplomatic lying. The best example of the degeneration of the Kaiser's early idealism is furnished by his waning interest in social legislation when he found that it did not check the growth of Socialism. The net result of his multiform activities has been to engender an imperialist mood in the nation. In a very real sense, therefore, he is the author of the present war, though Mr. McCabe's rather hurried conclusion of his book seems to allow the possibility that in the end the Kaiser may have been reluctantly overborne by the war-party. The author is accurate in his statement of facts, and has even spelled his German words correctly, which is so unusual in an Englishman as to be positively commendable. "Suppress" for "surpass" partly spoils the sense of a passage on page 156.

We have seen the passing of the old school of war correspondence, with its proud array of names like Russell, Grattan, Steevens, Burleigh, Julian Ralph, and Stephen Crane. But it has become the duty of the new mechanism of gathering news, under our highly scientific and impersonal conditions of warfare, to invest with the old, personal, and human equation those bald and deleted lines that the censor's hand now tardily vouchsafes the hungry, anxious reader. That the lack of a human equation was recognized by the military is evidenced by the creation at the British front of an official Eye-Witness to augment and rehearse the chary official dispatches: not without its humor is the fact that even this official occasionally ran foul of the London Censor. Perhaps the reason for this concession by the censors of the various antagonists was the direct effect such confidences had on recruiting; in any case, we find a partial return to the traditions of good impressionistic writing under the stress of action that was made classic by the older school.

Mr. Boyd Cable's "Between the Lines" (Dutton; $1.35 net) precisely illustrates the new method with commendable artistic success. He explains that his book, "all of which has been written at the front within sound of the German guns, and for the most part within shell and rifle range, is an attempt to tell something of the manner of struggle that has gone on for months between the lines along the western front, and more especially of what lies behind and goes to the making of those curt and vague terms of the war communiqués." Thus we find vividly wrought sketches of all the phases of the struggle presented through the various arms. Inspired by quotations such as "to the right a violent artillery bombardment has been in progress," or "a mine was successfully exploded under the enemy's trench," or "have maintained and consolidated our position in the captured trench," Mr. Cable has built up the scene and action lying behind these laconic dispatches. To resist the temptation to quote is difficult; it suffices to say that these readings "between the lines" are of more careful and conscious workmanship than the accounts it has been our fortune to read in the newspapers; and, strictly speaking, *qua* war correspondence, they do not pretend to the spontaneity and abandon of a journalist like Steevens in some of his Sudan and South

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

African dispatches. Mr. Cable, however, is always vivid, and successfully avoids monotony and repetition. On page 91 the proof-reader allows "breach" to take the place of "breech."

In two respects, at least, Herbert Leslie Stewart's lectures on "Nietzsche and the Ideals of Modern Germany" (Longmans; $2.10 net) are admirable. To the vexed question as to the amount of influence Nietzsche has exerted on Germany as we see that country to-day he gives a reasoned and, as it seems to us, sound reply. He states under three heads the position of those who deny to the philosopher any important influence, and makes his answers accordingly. In the first place "the doctrines of a philosopher are not either intimately known or greatly cared about by the mass of the public." To this argument he replies at length, giving emphasis to the facts that Nietzsche's " 'Immoralism' lent philosophical sanction to the selfishness and the unscrupulousness which had made his country successful in the past," and that "a huge proportion of the German middle class passes through the closely associated training of the university and the military corps," where public opinion is nurtured and where Nietzsche is acclaimed a prophet. The second point is that, "despite all his assaults on accepted morality, Nietzsche's influence has worked against the sinister spirit of racial aggression." But as an offset to this and to his individualism and anti-Teutonism must be set his doctrine of the different scales of individuals and societies and his constant declaration of the right of the higher to exploit the lower. The third point made by those who would minimize Nietzsche's influence is his ideal of cosmopolitan culture and his insistence on the fact that the day of separate, hostile nationalities is past. That ideal might seem to be working for peace, yet on the other side, and far more clamorous, as Mr. Stewart points out, is his support of war as an indispensable agent in racial advance.

It will thus be seen that, in summing up the direction and degree of Nietzsche's influence, we are bound to take account of the inconsistencies of his system, and by weighing these, one against the other, to determine which is central to his way of thinking and calculated to make an impression, and which is accidental and more or less negligible. It is just in ferreting out these inconsistencies, rather in laying his finger on the radical contradiction at the heart of Nietzsche's philosophy, that Mr. Stewart has succeeded in making a book which is of real significance amid the welter of commentaries now forced upon the reader's attention. In a word, that contradiction arises from Nietzsche's vehement denunciation of what he calls present values and his boasted "transvaluation of all values," when in reality he has no new values to substitute for the old. His philosophy is a proclamation of power, "the will to power," yet he was never able to arrive at any clear notion of the goal towards which this power should be directed. As a consequence, the real influence of his preaching has been simply to confirm men in their natural inclination to use power for the furtherance of whatever aim or inclination they already possess. We cannot follow Mr. Stewart in all his conclusions, but we can recommend his lectures as well worth reading.

A sprightly account of an unusual kind of travelling is given in Mrs. Lewis Chase's "Vagabond Voyage Through Brittany" (Lippincott; $2 net). The writer with her husband, an inexperienced boatman, managed to traverse the northern waterways from St. Malo to "savage Finistère," and has thus presented Brittany from a new angle—the angle of the towpath. Proceeding mainly through canals, *via* Rennes, Redon, and Pontivy to Brest, the travellers found that they were better able to pull a boat than to row one; the locks were so many lions in their path; but the lock-keepers and other waterside characters were prompt with hospitality and kindliness. Every night offered prospective adventure and various accommodation in tent, hayloft, or hamlet. Every day led on through the diversified and picturesque charm of wood and wave, monuments and bracken, châteaux and cottages. The interest is that of a road-novel, plotless, of course, but falling readily into stages and having a fair proportion of incident, accident, and observation. We are shown the good-nature and narrow-mindedness of the Bretons, their superstitions, their racial pride and close family bonds, their customs and costumes, their frugality, and even—since the writer is a woman—specimens of their cookery and soap-making. We get glimpses of the famous Château de Rohan, of legend at St. Aignan, and mass at Neuillac, of grewsome celebrations on the eve of All Souls'. There is, on the whole, less of historic and poetic Brittany than one might expect. But this lack, together with a compensating gain in freshness, grows out of the method of the writer, who depends everywhere on first-hand impressions and who avoided "getting up" Brittany beforehand. Occasionally, partial observation or knowledge is shown, as where the author seems unaware of the foreign confessionals at St. Peter's and of the fact that horses wear straw bonnets very generally in France. Spontaneity, humor, and human interest constitute the charm of the book. The style is free and easy, vivid enough and clever, though not always correct. There is sometimes vagueness and confusion in the thought and in the English; in the French, except when consciously bad, there are satisfyingly few "accents wild." The illustrations are excellent. The map does not show certain of the towns and streams mentioned. It is not the mystical and melancholy Brittany of Renan or even of Anatole Le Braz, but it is a country freshly seen through the practical eyes of a woman. When the travellers once asked if they were in the way, their hostess replied: "On the contrary, I find you very diverting." So says the present reader.

"What I Believe and Why," by William Hayes Ward (Scribner; $1.50), is the confession of faith of a scholar trained to examine the ground of his beliefs, and to state them distinctly and frankly. The veteran editor of the *Independent* declares that his only guide in the formation of beliefs is his own reason. He sees mind and matter in the world, but from recent researches in astronomy, chemistry, and physics he concludes that our stellar universe is not self-existent and not eternal, but had a beginning in time, and that it owes its existence to a superior power; a similar limitation in time he finds in the atomic constitution of matter. This superior power we call God. The evidence that God is a spirit is found in the reason of man and in the wonderful instinct, not explicable by ordinary laws of evolution, in lower animals, especially in certain insects. But elsewhere spirit is found in conjunction with a body, and it may be that the attenuated pervasive material substance, called by modern scientists "ether," is the body that the mind of God uses as the instrument of its work in the creation of all things. God is omniscient in our universe and omnipotent where omnipotence is possible—the human spirit endowed with free will cannot be controlled, and may become a source of evil in the world. God is to be regarded as essentially good and kind, though he is limited by the independent human will. So we must think of him, though it is improbable that a direct vision of God is possible for finite beings.

This acceptance of a good God is, in Dr. Ward's mind, the sum and substance of a rational theistic creed. For dogmas generally included in Christian creeds he cares little. His study of the Bible has led him to reject the theory of its plenary inspiration—we must examine, he says, every part of it and accept only what commends itself to our reason. He finds no ground in the Bible or in reason for the doctrine of the Trinity or for the expiatory nature of the death of Jesus or for a mediatorial function that has been ascribed to him. God is perfectly loving, and between him and man no day'sman is necessary. Jesus he reveres as the best of spiritual teachers, the best revealer of God to man. Dr. Ward has little or no confidence in the reports of miracles in the Bible or elsewhere. He accepts, however, the New Testament report of the resurrection of Jesus, holding that the testimony of eye-witnesses is too strong to be neglected. And this resurrection he regards as a pledge of immortality for man, a belief corroborated by the fact that man has a spiritual nature akin to that of God; and he adds that there is no good reason to doubt that there may be immortality for the lower animals also, since they, like man, have minds. Whether or not one agrees with all his reasonings, there will be no doubt in the reader's mind that Dr. Ward's volume is a sincere and able search for a spiritual religious faith in harmony with human reason. The essence of Christianity, he says, is love, and that man is a Christian, whatever the details of his theological creed, who lives a life of love for man and spiritual union with God.

"The Guide to the Law and Legal Literature of Spain," by Thomas W. Palmer, Jr. (Washington: Government Printing Office), is the third in a series of publications prepared under the directions of Mr. Borchard, law librarian of Congress. The book has a threefold aim: to furnish the lawyer and the student of comparative law with information as to the private and public law of Spain; to acquaint the legislator with the recent development of legislation, especially that of a social and economic character, and to furnish the jurist and historian with a guide to the contributions to the history, theory, and the philosophy of law. It is the last of these aims which has been best attained in the present volume. As a guide to Spanish legal literature, it is admirable. It contains, too, much useful information about modern labor legislation in Spain, but as a compendium of private and public law it is not altogether satisfactory. The student of comparative law is told in what books he may find existing rules, but he is not told what those rules are. About one-seventh of the volume is de-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

voted to commercial law, but these twenty-odd pages supply the reader with a mere modicum of legal knowledge. The paragraph on bills and notes gives the numbers of the sections in the Commercial Code covering the subject; refers to four treatises on topics relating to negotiable instruments, and describes the *aval* as "a document similar to our anomalous endorsement, although it may also be made restrictive." The bill of lading is referred to incidentally under the head of recent "railroad police regulation," but no information is vouchsafed as to its form or legal effect. Whether the law of Spain recognizes straight bills and order bills; whether a Spanish bill of lading may be employed to reserve title in the shipper, and whether it is non-negotiable, or quasi or fully negotiable, are questions upon which Mr. Palmer's Guide throws no light. Perhaps this is due to the fact that he was a Law-School fellow, and not a lawyer of practical experience.

The original Latin text of the "Incendium Amoris," by Richard Rolle of Hampole, the famous Yorkshire mystic of the fourteenth century, had remained unprinted down to the past year. Only the autobiographical chapter (ch. 15), in which Rolle describes briefly the development of his religious life until his final attainment of a mystical communion with the divine spirit, was included even in the sixteenth-century editions of his Latin writings. Miss Margaret Deanesly has now given us a careful edition of this treatise (Longmans; $3.25 net), in the Publications of the University of Manchester (Historical Series, No. XXVI). One must confess that it does not make very interesting reading. The world has travelled far from the time when one of its representative minds could declare, as Rolle does in this book: "All love that has not God as its object is wickedness and renders its possessors wicked." Nowadays we like to think of the Fire of Love as radiating warmth in a lateral as well as vertical direction. Even the autobiographical chapter referred to above has little of the individual stamp. We feel that we have read it all somewhere else before in the innumerable Saints' Lives of the Middle Ages. Altogether, Rolle's record of his experiences seems meagre enough when contrasted with Charles Reade's narrative of his fictitious hermit—a marvel of charm and pathos—in "The Cloister and the Hearth." Besides, the treatise, as a whole, has no regular structure. As Miss Deanesly observes, its main purpose is "the vindication of the life of the hermit or solitary, not merely from the charge of laziness and vagabondage, but of inferiority to the busy and active prelate, or the devout monk." This he accomplishes by a series of more or less unconnected discourses. Our editor concludes that Hugh of St. Victor is the writer whose influence is most clearly traceable in Rolle's work.

The "Incendium Amoris" exists in two forms, *viz.*, the full text and an abbreviated version which was prepared, apparently, not very long after the composition of the original work. Curiously enough, the best manuscript of the treatise, Emmanuel MS. 35, is one of the shortened version, but with those passages of the long text which had been omitted completely restored in the margins or on interpolated sheets. This was the work of John Newton, treasurer of York Cathedral at the beginning of the fifteenth century, who notes that he restored the full text from a copy of the "Incendium" in Rolle's own handwriting. It was an American scholar, Miss Hope Allen, of Radcliffe College, who first called attention to this important manuscript. Besides the usual introductory matter, including a very full description of the manuscripts, of which there are twenty-six in England alone, Miss Deanesly has given us a life of John Newton and a history of the foundation of Sion Abbey, where Newton's manuscript was formerly deposited — both based on documentary researches.

The elaborate Supplement, published nominally with the July number of the *American Journal of International Law*, though it has only recently appeared, gives occasion for a tribute to the excellent service which that scholarly journal has rendered during the past year and for a brief summary of the contents of the last two numbers. The Supplement under consideration is a volume of more than 400 large 8vo pages, clearly printed on excellent paper, containing the Diplomatic Correspondence Between the United States and Belligerent Governments Relating to Neutral Rights and Commerce—a most valuable compilation—with a table of contents of 44 pages classifying the correspondence under separate headings, giving dates, the authors and addressees, the subject in each case, and the page of the pamphlet on which to look for the several documents. At the end is also an index, carefully prepared. Certain auxiliary documents are included, as rules governing the granting and issuing of passports in the United States. The correspondence is printed from official texts furnished by the Department of State of the United States. Complete as it is, and well arranged for reference, its value, to editors or any one else having occasion to discuss questions that have arisen and been debated in correspondence between our Government and any of the belligerent Powers, must be obvious. The following summary of titles or headings will indicate the comprehensiveness of the collection: Papers relating to the Declaration of London; those relating to articles listed as contraband of war; correspondence relating to restraints on commerce; foodstuffs cargo of the American ship Wilhelmina in British Prize Court; destruction of American merchantman William P. Frye by German cruiser Prinz Eitel Friedrich; proclamations of neutrality, and papers relating to neutrality—appeal by the President as to Panama Canal Zone, etc.; violation of neutrality by belligerent warships; defensive armaments and the right, on departure from neutral ports, of belligerent merchant ships to arm at sea; internment of the German ships Geier and Locksun; questions relating to neutrality—correspondence between the Secretary of State and the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; transmission of mail of American diplomatic and consular officers; censorship of telegrams transmitted by cable and wireless; Belgian relief; attempt of German ship Odenwald to sail without clearance papers; detention of the American ship Seguranca—and ditto as to American ship Waco; internment of the German ship Prinz Eitel Friedrich; internment of the German cruiser Kronprinz Wilhelm; detention of August Piepenbrink; internment of the German prize ship Farn; non-contraband character of hydroaeroplanes; dual nationality; circular instructions and correspondence relating to the issuing of passports. The *Journal* is published for the Society by Baker, Voorhis & Co., New York.

In the July number itself much space was also devoted, both editorially and in signed articles, to questions suggested by vital issues raised in the European conflict. Inevitably those raised by the intrusion of the submarine into ocean belligerency received great attention, especially in a signed article by James W. Garner on "Questions of International Law in the European War" and an elaborate editorial on "The Controversy between the United States and Germany over the Use of Submarines against Merchant Vessels." Both state the facts at the foundation of the discussion and the attitude of the respective Governments on the question, and an indication is given of the extent to which the introduction of the submarine varies the doctrine of the belligerent right of visitation and search as heretofore acknowledged by civilized nations. Due attention is paid to the German contentions, but obviously the question is raised whether, since the use of the submarine as a commerce destroyer involves the ignoring of well-settled rules of war, it can be justified legally on any conceivable grounds. An editorial comment quotes our Department of State as having declared in September, 1914, that "a merchant vessel of belligerent nationality may carry an armament and ammunition for the sole purpose of defence without acquiring the character of a ship of war." As bearing on the assertion of a right to sink ships without attempting to rescue neutral passengers, another paper quotes Admiral Semmes, Confederate commander of the Alabama, as saying that, when he destroyed the Hatteras, a warship, "every living being on it was safely conveyed to the Alabama." One paper discusses the doctrine of continuous voyages in the eighteenth century—a doctrine adjudicated on in cases in the United States Supreme Court half a century ago. The Frye case and the neutrality of Belgium are discussed editorially, the latter discussion being followed by several pages of official reports found in the secret archives in Brussels.

The preceding number of the *Journal* also contained separately printed Supplements, which gave, in complete detail, the diplomatic correspondence respecting the war published by the French Government. The editorial comments, covering sixty pages, discussed such topics as American neutrality, use of neutral flags on merchant vessels of belligerent Powers, violation of neutral waters, seizure and detention of neutral cargoes, visit and search, our correspondence with other Powers concerning the war, internment of German vessels in the United States, the effect of Mr. Bryan's peace treaties upon the relations of the United States with the nations at war, and kindred topics. So high an authority as William Cullen Dennis discussed the diplomatic correspondence leading up to the war, and Norman Bentwich considered the questions of trading with an enemy and Great Britain's application of the principles of international law. The venerable Connecticut jurist and statesman, Simeon E. Baldwin, disregarding the maxim that in the midst of wars the laws are silent, renewed consideration of the timeliness and appropriateness of an Anglo-American prize tribunal. Arthur H. Kuhn wrote of the international aspects of the Titanic case. Philip Marshall Brown contributed a paper of considerable breadth and power on the theory of the independence and equality of states.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Drama

LIMITATIONS OF THE ACTUAL.

Contemporary French Dramatists. By Barrett H. Clark. Cincinnati: Stewart & Kidd Co. $1.50 net.

Four Plays by Emile Augier. Translated by Barrett H. Clark. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $1.50 net.

Mr. Clark is a most industrious and prolific writer about the theatre. Of his wide acquaintance with his subject and the general accuracy of his facts—for he is a careful compiler—there can be no question. His summaries of plays, and biographical notes of the authors, will be very useful to the hasty reader in search of superficial information, if not particularly satisfying to the conscientious student. His critical opinions, however, and his comparative estimates—although some of them are shrewd and sound enough—are too much influenced by his admiration of advanced types of the modern sexual drama to carry much weight with them. The recklessness of some of his generalizations makes him a most untrustworthy guide. To say, for instance, that there is a general antipathy in America to the sex play, which has flourished here in its worst forms, is a pretty bold assertion. The reference, of course, is to plays of lawless passion. Virtually all drama treats of sex, an almost indispensable motive, against which no sane person ever dreamed of protesting, except when it is debased and falsified by morbid, unnatural, and deliberately salacious treatment.

It is a strange notion that naturalism, or realism, is a new thing upon the stage. From the first it has been the essence of drama and has existed side by side with the conventions which at times have obscured it. As a matter of fact much of the vaunted realism of these latter days has been as untrue to nature as were any of the old artificialities. Doubtless, Antoine did good service to the theatre by breaking the shackles imposed by outworn traditions, but, nevertheless, much of his realism was utterly vulgar and unimaginative, or else rank sensationalism. His extravagances, having no substantial foundation in truth or art, had no permanent attractive power. His rough ploughing, however, broke new ground, which was to prove fertile under superior tillage.

Despite his bias in favor of the new and strange in drama, Mr. Clark discerns part of the reason why François de Curel failed to win, in the theatre, a success proportionate to his distinguished abilities. It was not so much the abnormality of his psychology that was to blame as the manifest arbitrariness and unreasonableness of it. His physiological analyses may be extraordinarily subtle, but are uninteresting and unconvincing, because the characters subject to dissection are not human, but too clearly inventions to meet the exigencies of a thesis. They do not appeal to sympathy or commonsense. As wise, old, cynical Falstaff said, "Ware instinct!" His rapid survey of the work of Brieux is, in the main, appreciative and just, but he exaggerates both the boldness and the value of his social-thesis plays. Honest in intent, they deal with facts patent to ordinary intelligence, and are, therefore, negligible as instructive forces. In so far as they provoke an idle or morbid curiosity, they must be, in the theatre, more pernicious than helpful. Few competent critics would place "La Robe Rouge" above "Les Trois Filles de M. Dupont." No one disputes the ability of Brieux, and the development of it in new channels in "Le Bourgeois aux Champs" warrants the hope that his best work is yet to be done.

"Every play of Porto-Riche is a love story," says Mr. Clark. It is a characteristically careless sentence. Love and lust are not synonymous, nor are literary grace and dexterity and a witty but often vulgar cynicism the chief components or demonstrations of dramatic genius. From the hurried sketch of Hervieu the uninformed reader will learn little but the opinions of the author, some of which are open to peremptory challenge. Among them is the conclusion that "Le Dédale" is the dramatist's masterpiece. Theatrical merit, of the obvious sort, it has in abundance, and it is, in certain ways, amazingly clever, but measured by any sound dramatic standard, it is worthless. Literary glitter it has, but in substance it is cheap and nasty melodrama.

The article on Rostand is just and appreciative, but does not grasp the true secret of his triumph. The future historian of the theatre, it is suggested, may be puzzled to account for the popular success of "Cyrano de Bergerac." There is no mystery in the matter except the one involved in the immortality of Shakespeare. Imagination—embodying, adorning, and elevating the truth of nature—must always, in prose or verse, be the most potent permanent force in the theatre. The fundamental error of the realists lies in the notion that truth can exist only in actuality, that the particular is more vital than the general. They do not, possibly cannot, perceive that realism is only a finite thing, limited by its own definitions, an essential part, but only a part, of the imaginative, which virtually has no boundaries except those imposed by reason. Therefore, imagination includes all the contents of realism and much more, and will have rich stores in abundance of fresh thought and beauty and inspiration to offer, in prose and verse, long after the resources of realism have been exhausted or become tedious. Rostand, a great genius, provided a feast for the intellect as well as the senses, and effective drama to boot, and a world, weary of perverted passion and drab morbidity, gave him rapturous greeting. There can be no enduring charm or value in prurient studies of sexual abnormalities. Mr. Clark presumably would deny this, or he could scarcely shower such laudation upon "Le Pardon" of Lemaître, and other kindred pieces, which may be realistic, in the narrowest sense, and commercially profitable, but are utterly unveracious.

Sometimes, as in his superficial sketch of the clever and ingenious Capus, he seems to intimate that the plays in which a frivolous author adopts a semi-serious tone are on that account unworthy of consideration. His prejudice in favor of advanced methods in the delineation of sexual vagaries prevents him from seeing how radically false these illustrations often are to the nature they profess to portray. This critical astigmatism is especially revealed in his article on Bataille. He is justified in his praise of the dexterity of Bernstein as a sensational plot- and scene-maker, but is apparently unconscious of the gross defects that make him insignificant as a true dramatist. Mr. Clark has written an entertaining and comprehensive hand-book, full of useful memoranda, but exhibits few of the qualifications of a serious and discerning critic.

The four plays by Emile Augier, which Mr. Clark has translated, are "Le Mariage d'Olympe," "Le Gendre de M. Poirier," "Les Fourchambault," and "Le Post-Scriptum." Of these the first three are famous, and have been played in this country in more or less modified form. They exhibit three phases of Augier's great dramatic ability, and, as they have not hitherto appeared in English dress, this version doubtless will find many readers. Brieux provides a brief laudatory preface and Mr. Clark an introduction.

J. Ranken Towse.

MRS. FISKE IN "ERSTWHILE SUSAN."

A setting new to the New York stage was seen last week when Mrs. Fiske appeared in "Erstwhile Susan." It is not an attractive setting, this life among the Pennsylvania "Dutch," having even more angularity than "Down East" Maine. The dialect is of course amusing, with its welter of adverbs and prepositions awry; yet the brutal domination of the women by the men (which one must infer to be the rule) leaves little room for that ray of spirituality which does occasionally break through the hard daily round of life in Maine. For the purpose of art some device had to be contrived to relieve the grayness of this setting, and in the present play, which is founded on one of Mrs. Martin's Mennonite stories, a character is introduced who, though transcending the limits of probability, forms a "fat" part and provides Mrs. Fiske with an opportunity for sparkling comedy. If only one could stifle one's feeling that quite such violence to the facts was unnecessary, the play would be thoroughly entertaining.

For it is inconceivable that a young woman, even one with a strain of the adventuress in her, would link herself, by the agency of a matrimonial bureau, to a person of Barnaby Dreary's domineering character. Juliet (erstwhile Susan) Miller, "an elocutionist from Iowa," answers Barnaby's inquiry because she is devoted to his daughter, a shy, downtrodden girl, whom she has been seeing once a week on the latter's rounds, selling tins. Once installed as the third Mrs Dreary, Juliet begins that process of regeneration, especially with the daughter, which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

she has had at heart. She herself has independent means as a result of lawsuits pressed against Iowa newspapers at the time of her great adventure: Being jilted by an actor, she had taken the proposed honeymoon by herself and had been promptly accused of travelling with the actor unmarried. This delicious episode is typical of Juliet Miller, though she also possesses certain fine traits of heart which contribute subtlety to her picturesqueness. She has a craving to be extreme, especially in her dress, but she also has wit and a desire for real culture. It is a character that in a less improbable setting might have scored a great success.

Mrs. Fiske played the part with an ease which was delightful. If only her enunciation had been as distinct throughout the entire play as it was during the first half, her friends would have been rejoiced to believe that she had at last taken her tendency to be inarticulate seriously to heart. Yet even with this drawback, her impersonation of Erstwhile Susan gave genuine pleasure to a large audience. The rôle of Barnabetta, the abused daughter, was admirably taken by Madeline Delmar, who even as a drudge gave some hint of the charming qualities which were to appear after her sojourn in Boston at a fashionable boarding school—not an easy bit of characterization. F.

"THE CINDERELLA MAN."

After an unpromising first act, Edward Childs Carpenter's comedy, produced this week at the Hudson Theatre, develops into a very charming play, the quality of which steadily improves right up to the final curtain. It is a delicately sentimental little piece, and there are moments when one fears that the sentiment is going to descend to sentimentality, but it never does. The author is skilful in passing lightly over these dangerous spots, and he is fortunate in having the assistance of two clever players. Almost the whole burden of the play is on the shoulders of Shelley Hull, as Anthony Quintard, and Miss Phœbe Foster, as Marjorie Caner. Both are difficult rôles: less ably played, the young man might easily be an offensive prig, and the young woman a gushing schoolgirl. Miss Foster and Mr. Hull succeed in keeping the play always at the right level of delicate sentiment and idyllic love.

The story is of a princess and a pauper—the princess being Marjorie, daughter of a steel magnate, who, on account of separation from his wife, now dead, has only just made his daughter's acquaintance; the pauper being a disinherited young man, who is determined to conquer the world by writing poetry. Across the roofs from the rich man's house is the attic of the poet, poor and proud. Through the medium of a piece of verse and a mutual friend the princess becomes interested in the poet, and, it being Christmas time, determines, willy-nilly, that he shall be fed and cheered. So she plays Kris Kringle, going to his attic window across the snow-covered roof with a burden of good things. Of course, the poet returns before she can escape, and the first meeting leads to many others, at which a kind of etherialized courtship proceeds under the guise of a fairy-godmotherly relationship. The end comes through a viciously virtuous landlady, and then the problem for the princess is how to induce the proud poet to marry her, for his views are pronounced on the subject of heiresses, and she has deceived him into believing her to be only the princess's companion. The reunion is brought about through the medium of a competition for the libretto of an opera, which naturally the poet wins, and an old servant, whose performance, by Frank Bacon, lent a very pleasant touch to the piece. The management of the recognition scene, in which the princess reveals herself—an obvious pitfall for the inexpert—is not the least skilful thing in the play, and here again a great deal of credit is due to the acting of Mr. Hull and Miss Foster.

The piece is well staged and uniformly well acted. The author has managed his situations with considerable skill, and the dialogue contains a good many lines of that subtle humor which affects the audience with gradually swelling ripples of laughter as the full significance sinks in. S. W.

"JUST A WOMAN."

Mr. Eugene Walter's new play, presented at the Forty-eighth Street Theatre, will add to his reputation, acquired in spite of the early promise of "The Easiest Way," as a writer of sensational rubbish. The principal characters are "The Woman" and "The Man"—note the impertinence of the nomenclature, asserting for a cheap bit of theatricality a kind of sanction in eternal types. From poverty and mutual devotion they descend to affluence and estrangement. The Man, anxious to free himself from his marriage ties and entangled with another woman, in collusion with detectives concocts charges of infidelity against his wife. Naturally there is a scene in a court-room; fate has decreed that "red-blooded" drama this season shall be incomplete without one. The Woman refuses to defend herself; only when told that the judge has no option but to grant the husband a decree and custody of the child does she change her attitude. To keep her child (the word should be dissyllabic in the fine old melodramatic fashion) she takes the witness stand, avows that all that has been said against her character is true, and declares that the child is not her husband's. Whereupon the Man, hitherto kept carefully off the scene, rushes forward to proclaim that he is a perjurer and conspirator. Ten years later he comes out of jail quite reformed, and there is a triangular reconciliation in the usual flower-bedecked cottage. The scene in the court-room is, of course, nothing but claptrap theatricalism, but the climax is well worked up and is undeniably effective. One qualifiedly good act in four is not, however, sufficient to save the play. The rest is dull, gloomy, and intolerably "talky."

No pains have been spared on the production of the play, although the first scene, an elaborate set showing the steel mills of Pittsburgh, by its very attention to detail defeats its own object. The acting is decidedly good. Miss Josephine Victor plays the Woman with wise restraint until the climactic scene, in which she is effective. The Man is played with considerable technical ability but a too apparent lack of interest by Walter Hampden, a capable actor, who is wasted in the part. The best opportunity is afforded by the rôle of the Judge, which is well played by Walter Wilson. A neat bit of character work is done by John Arthur as a Bohemian coachman, and George Stuart Christie is good as the inventor who has made the Man's fortune and supports the Woman through her trials. S. W.

Music

HOW TO PLAY OLD MUSIC.

Many pianists, violinists, and organists believe that expression in music is a modern thing and that the old music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries requires nothing beyond mechanical precision. This attitude arouses the ire of Arnold Dolmetsch. Mr. Dolmetsch is an Englishman who has devoted his whole life to the study of mediæval instruments, some of which he and his wife play with great skill. Unique, prominent figures in London society, they were introduced by George Moore among the characters in one of his novels. Some years ago they came across the ocean to exhibit their skill in American cities and to make converts to their belief that the discarded harpsichord and clavichord are nobler instruments than our pianofortes. One of our leading firms was persuaded to manufacture some harpsichords in the hope of creating a demand for these instruments of the day of Bach and Handel; but, so far as known to the writer, nothing has come of this movement except an occasional harpsichord performance in New York or Boston by Arthur Whiting.

Mr. Dolmetsch now returns to his charge with a volume of nearly five hundred pages, entitled "The Interpretation of the Music of the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries" (New York: The H. W. Gray Co.). It is an extremely valuable book for all who intend to play the older music on either the older or the newer instruments. With the aid of citations from the pages of rare treatises in French, German, and Italian, he proves conclusively that those musicians who play the music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries exactly as printed, without reading between the lines, are bunglers. "As soon as it is recognized that not only is it not 'wrong' to give the old music its natural expression, but, on the contrary, that the so-called traditional way of playing it is an insult to its beauty, the players will not be afraid to follow their own instinct, and the music will come to life again." Even Bach's music, which is saturated with passion and romance, is often played in a mechanical, lifeless way. I well remember an eminent professor who used to rattle off Bach's fugues fortissimo, without pause or shading of any kind, from the first bar to the last. He did this because no expression marks were printed with the music. But it was not customary, in the olden days, to print them, the musicians being credited with sufficient taste to apply them at the right places themselves. It is inconceivable that the composer of works capable of such intense and varied expression as Bach's should have played them in a mechanical, lifeless way. Fortunately, we have indisputable evidence that he did not, in a treatise by his personal friend, Quantz, which has a chapter entitled Of Good Expression

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in General in Singing or Playing. From this Mr. Dolmetsch translates and cites the following:

A good execution should also be full of variety. You must continually oppose light and shade, for you will certainly fail to be touching if you play always either loud or soft—if you use, so to speak, always the same color, and do not know how to increase or abate the tone when required. You must therefore use frequent changes from *forte* to *piano*.

Quantz proceeds to compare expression in music to that of an orator. Both, he says, "want to touch the heart, to excite or appease the movements of the soul, and to carry the auditor from one passion to another. . . . The good effect of music depends almost as much upon the player as the composer." In another paragraph he says that, "as in most pieces there is a perpetual change of passions, the player must be able to judge which feeling is in each thought, and to regulate his execution upon that." These remarks leave no doubt that good players in Bach's time indulged as much in expression as modern players do, the chief difference being that more was formerly left to the instincts of the player or singer. Beethoven was the first of the great masters who used expression marks freely.

Long before Bach and Quantz, Giulio Caccini, one of the Florentine musicians who originated Italian opera, declared that he called that "the noble manner of singing" in which the artist is not tied strictly to the measure, but changes the value of the notes in accordance with the import of the words. Here we have an early (1601) suggestion of what is commonly called *tempo rubato*. Mr. Dolmetsch devotes a number of pages to this subject, leaving no doubt that players were expected to regulate the tempo and its modifications. One of his citations makes it clear that madrigals, for instance, about the year 1600, were sung very freely as regards tempo; now slowly, now quickly, the beat even stopping awhile if the sense of the phrase required it. Altogether, Mr. Dolmetsch makes out a good case for his contention regarding expression in the older music. At the same time one may doubt that it played so important a part in music as it does in modern works. A very large percentage of the music played in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries consisted of dances, and these, naturally, did not usually appeal to the deeper feelings. Concerning the tempo of the dances of European countries, Mr. Dolmetsch has some remarks which will come as a revelation to most musicians. He shows how most dances, when first introduced, were lively, and gradually got slower. To know how fast a minuet, or sarabande, or courante should be taken, one must therefore know to what period it belongs.

The greater part of Mr. Dolmetsch's volume is devoted to the ornamentations which were so important in the old music, because the harpsichords lacked the power of sustaining tones possessed by modern pianofortes. In his final chapter the author renews his plea for the revival not only of the harpsichord, but of other mediæval instruments, among them the recorder, concerning which, he assures us, people often say: "How much more beautiful it is than the flute! How can it have been superseded?" He is also very anxious to have the tenor violin brought back. Nor is he quite content with the modern organ. An organist of to-day can, he admits, give a chromo-lithograph of a complicated orchestral piece like the prelude of Wagner's "Meistersinger"; but "he has not the right tone to play a chorale, if the organ is up-to-date." On such an organ modern compositions are all right, "but it is a revelation to hear Handel's or Bach's music on a well-preserved old organ." Reflecting on the comparative advantages and disadvantages of the older and the newer instruments, on which Mr. Dolmetsch comments in detail, one cannot but hope and believe that some musical Burbank of the future will combine the merits of both, while eliminating their faults.

HENRY T. FINCK.

Art

THE LOAN EXHIBITION OF SPANISH PAINTING AT THE FOGG MUSEUM.

The choice of Spain as the country to be honored in an exhibition is a token, not only of the cordial relations reëstablished between America and that nation, but also of the rapidly increasing enthusiasm for Spanish art. Many other signs point in the same direction—the popularity of Spanish pictures among our private collectors, the creation of the important but as yet unappreciated gallery of the Hispanic Society at New York, the establishment of a course upon Spanish art at Harvard. It is partly in connection with this course that the present exhibition at the Fogg Museum has been arranged through the intelligent kindness and energy of the directors.

The examples that have been lent are as representative of the development of Spanish painting as any which the museum of a university could hope to obtain. Omissions there were bound to be; but the two names that are most conspicuous by their absence, Ribera and Murillo, are those that, if not from the evolutionary, at least from the æsthetic, standpoint, could most easily be spared.

Of the "primitive" works that have as yet so rarely been exported, the Boston Museum has sent one of the two best in America, a large Coronation of the Virgin, by an unnamed artist of eastern Spain, the other being the sumptuous St. Engracia at Fenway Court. In the lack of any former serious attempts at attribution, I would suggest for the Boston picture some Aragonese painter, active in the middle of the fifteenth century. In any case, the panel is a beautiful and typical specimen of the school of eastern Spain, which held the hegemony in the peninsula throughout the whole primitive period, centring at Barcelona, the capital of Catalonia, but extending its provincial ramifications into Aragon. Three of the sources that coalesced to form the gently moving stream of Catalan art are here clearly to be discerned, the Sienese in the long flowing garment of Christ, the International in the slender types, the love of splendor, and the rich warmth of the tonality, the Flemish in the medium of oil. The decorative effect, which the eastern Spaniards valued more than the contemporary Italians, is derived from the usual diapered gold background, from the usual exact symmetry in composition, and from the usual prominence of large and florid brocades. If American purchasers could only be shown a few more early Catalan altarpieces of the importance of this Coronation, which is not surpassed by the many examples still to be seen in Catalonia and Aragon, the Spanish primitives would soon encroach upon the market now commanded by the Italians.

There was no need of illustrating the lifeless imitation of Italian classicism through which Spain, like other European countries, had to pass during the sixteenth century in order to attain correctness of drawing and composition. The poverty of artistic talent among the classicists of Philip II's reign was such that he had recourse to a foreign portraitist, Antony Mor; and the most famous native pupil of this Fleming, Alonso Sanchez Coello, is represented by a fine portrait, probably of Philip's third wife, Isabel of Valois, in which the hard and rigid style of Antony Mor, with its meticulous technique, its light, metallic colors, and its sharp outlines, combines with the stiffness of contemporary costume to form a fitting expression of the formality and ceremoniousness of the Spanish court. Coello's own less gifted follower, Pantoja de la Cruz, has contributed to the exhibition a characteristic head of the gloomy monarch himself.

The reaction against classicism is embodied in a more striking than beautiful veronica by Francisco de Ribalta, the Valencian master, who is just coming to his own and who, as the teacher of Ribera, helps to fill, in the exhibition, the lacuna of the "Little Spaniard's" works. The picture fortunately belongs, not to Ribalta's classic, but to his reactionary manner, which constitutes one of the principal links between the Eclectics and Tenebrosi of Italy and the painting of the Spanish Golden Age. The harsh red tonality, the dramatic chiaroscuro, the almost painful naturalism of the sacred head were soon to become commonplaces in the art of the peninsula. The canvases of El Greco, who incarnated rather an avowed rebellion against classicism, number no less than six. A memorable portrait of a man in armor, one of his customary penetrating characterizations of the gaunt Spanish masculine type, with all its pride, melancholy, and mysticism, shows how great he was when he chose to work in ordinary chan-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nels. The other five pictures are all in his Post-Impressionistic phase: a St. Mary and a St. John, evidently sections of a Crucifixion, revealing his restless chromatic experimentation; one of his several similar repetitions of St. Paul's bust, in which his own neurotic temperament enabled him to extract and reproduce the very essence of asceticism; an Agony in the Garden, where conception, composition, fantastic drawing, weird sweep of color, and bizarre, nocturnal lighting unite to form a powerful imaginative effect of the supernatural; and an Annunciation, of his last period, when his wild but never meaningless extravagances in every aspect of technique demonstrate that he was painting to satisfy, not the public, but the necessity of his own perturbed inner being.

The mature and best art of the Golden Age may be seen in the Villahermosa portrait of Olivares, by Velazquez, and in a large St. Ignatius de Loyola by Zurbaran. The former, one of the world's masterpieces, is too well known to need any comment. In itself it is enough to make an exhibition. The latter is not so typical of its master, because there is no discordant note to betray the provincial that Zurbaran always remained. Here he does not seek to make a point of his drapery, nor does he fall into any dissonance of color. The effigy of the founder of the Jesuits stands rather for the best in Zurbaran. He has abandoned the mannered chiaroscuro of the Tenebrosi, and following the precedent set at Seville by Roelas under the influence of Tintoretto, he has relieved the dark figure of St. Ignatius against a light landscape, here suffused with one of the favorite tonalities of the century, the silver-gray. Above all a monastic artist, he gives to his saint something of the cloister's quiet devotion, in contrast to Ribera's orgies of religious sentiment. Since his simple nature is unable to cope with the complicated problems of large compositions, he is most successful in single figures, or, as some one has said, in monologues.

To the later school of Madrid belongs one of Mazo's devitalized imitations of Velazquez, a Mariana of Austria, in front of which one might stop longer, were it not for the inevitable comparison with his father-in-law. Mazo's successor as court-painter, Carreño, finds a place with two creditable portraits, one of the weak-minded young King, Charles II, as usual so unsparing in its truth that it is hard to understand how its author retained his position, and the other, of his natural older brother, Don Juan de Austria, in significant historical juxtaposition, because the latter seems to have been the only man in the kingdom who, if he had not died prematurely, might have staved off the national decline. Artistic decadence is already apparent in a feeble portrait of a lady by Claudio Coello, under whom the indigenous school died a lingering death. It would have been inauspicious, however, if the exhibition had ended here, and two more superb portraits testify to the resurrection under Goya.

C. R. Post.

Finance

THE "WAR MUNITIONS COMPANIES."

From the start four considerations existed in the problem, what the shares of "war munitions companies" were worth. These were the amount of war orders received and filled; the offsets, if any, to the estimated rate of profit; the actual net earnings, therefore, in the quarter or the year, and the amount paid out in dividends. In none of these companies have events thus far answered all these doubtful questions; in most, only the first question has yet been even approximately answered. The American Locomotive Company, which, according to Wall Street, received $75,000,000 of war orders, and whose shares advanced 55¾ points in 1915, last week reported $2,956,000 net earnings for the last half of 1915, as against $490,000 deficit the year before; but it declared no dividends.

Westinghouse Electric, which was supposed to have $60,000,000 of war orders, and whose stocks advanced from 32 to 74⅞, increased its quarterly dividend on September 22 from 1 per cent. to 1½, but issued no statement of earnings. The Allis-Chalmers Company, which had large sub-contracts for munitions, and whose common stock went from 7¾ to 49⅛, declared on December 6 the first dividend on its preferred stock, only paying 1½ per cent. for the quarter and 1½ more against past dividends accrued. But here, too, figures of actual earnings were lacking.

None of these "war-order companies" had excited such interest as the Bethlehem Steel, which was the first and largest recipient of such orders. It was a war-material plant already, and its price on the Stock Exchange had risen from 64¼ in January of 1915 to 600 in October. Last week, the Bethlehem directors voted a 30 per cent. dividend on the common stock, payable during 1916; the first dividend ever paid. But no official report of earnings came with it; last year, the report for the preceding twelvemonth was not published until the end of March.

So the question remains with all the companies, whether earlier expectations of earnings, not to mention dividends, will eventually be fulfilled. What has the trade to say of this? Among the reasons advanced for this uncertainty regarding the "war industrials" one frequently heard is the advancing cost of raw materials.

Forging billets, one of the materials used in shrapnel, are now quoted at $55 to $60 a ton, compared with $24 a year ago. Copper is selling at 24½ cents a pound, as against 13½ cents last January, and about 11 cents in September, 1914. The ordinary commercial grades of zinc have advanced from 6½ cents about a year ago to 18 cents or more at present, while the higher grades, used in the manufacture of brass, have sold at 35 cents or more. Quicksilver, used in the manufacture of fulminate of mercury, is now selling around $225 a flask, compared with an average price in recent years of about $40 a flask.

While it has been generally stated in the steel trade that a prospective maker of munitions is almost invariably "covered" before accepting business, there are various opinions as to what is implied in "covered." Manufacturers of steel billets, blooms, and bars refuse to give options, in the usual sense of the word. The best they will do is to name a price to hold good for, say, forty-eight hours. After that time the prospective maker of munitions must take his chances in the open market. A large copper concern was recently quoting copper at 24 cents for spot acceptance, and 24¼ if the buyer wished a night's delay before placing the order.

A much graver problem confronting the makers of munitions—the gravest problem, it was said last week in steel circles—is the congestion of shipping on both land and water, with consequent delays, expenses, and disarrangement of working schedules. Many of the contracts with foreign governments are believed not only to provide bonuses for deliveries made ahead of time, but penalties for delays. In their anxiety to obtain shells, guns, railway supplies, and the other necessities of warfare, this penalty provision is believed to have remained unexercised in nearly all cases.

There are other ways in which delays in shipping have caused expense. One manufacturer, who had completed an order for shells except for the placing in position of the copper band which encircles the base of the projectile, found that he could not obtain delivery of the bands for weeks to come. Rather than submit to the delay—which would involve delay in receiving payment—he bought the bands elsewhere, at an advanced price. Similar cases have been common.

Still another source of delay and expense has been the practice of letting parts of the work on sub-contract. That is, the manufacturer receiving the original order will divide it with other companies, doing, perhaps, only a small part of the work himself. The closest kind of team-work is necessary in cases of this sort, and when one of the sub-contractors has "fallen down" it has been necessary to get the work done elsewhere, regardless of cost, or else hold up, perhaps, the whole of the business in hand.

These are among the numerous questions which the detailed reports of the companies will help to settle during the next few months, and which the stock market has been trying to settle beforehand.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

FICTION.

Caine, W. Bildad the Quilldriver. Lane. $1.25 net.

Cresswell, C. M. The Making and Breaking of Almansur. Dodd, Mead. $1.35 net.

Harcourt, S. A Pair of Silk Stockings. Dodd, Mead. $1.25 net.

McFarlane, P. C. Held to Answer. Little, Brown. $1.35 net.

Ruck, B. The Boy with Wings. Dodd, Mead. $1.35 net.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MISCELLANEOUS.

Abraham, G. D. On Alpine Heights and British Crags. Houghton Mifflin. $2.50 net.
Bulletin of the John Rylands Library. Vol. 2. Manchester: The University Press. 6d. net.
Central Conference of American Rabbis. Year Book, Vol. XXV.
Guyer, M. F. Being Well-Born. Bobbs-Merrill. $1 net.
Journal of Religious Psychology. Edited by G. S. Hall. Vol. 7. Worcester, Mass.: Louis N. Wilson.
Lee, Sir S. A Life of William Shakespeare. New edition, rewritten and enlarged. Macmillan. $2.
On Staying at Home and Other Essays. Anonymous. Longmans, Green. $1.25 net.
Powys, T. F. The Soliloquy of a Hermit. New York: G. A. Shaw.
Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure. The American Association of University Professors.
Smith, S. Who Is Insane? Macmillan. $1.25 net.
The American Whitaker Almanac and Encyclopedia, 1916. Macmillan.
Whitmore, C. E. The Supernatural in Tragedy. Harvard University Press. $1.75 net.
Wylie, L. J. Social Studies in English Literature. (The Vassar Semi-Centennial Series.) Houghton Mifflin. $1.75 net.

GOVERNMENT AND ECONOMICS.

Nearing, S. Anthracite. Philadelphia: Winston.
Tinkham, G. H. California Men and Events. Privately printed.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.

Herrick, R. The World Decision. Houghton Mifflin. $1.25 net.
Lounsbury, T. R. The Life and Times of Tennyson. Yale University Press. $2.50 net.

POETRY.

Dodd, L. W. The Middle Miles. Yale University Press. 50 cents.
Holborn, I. B. S. Children of Fancy. New York: G. A. Shaw.

SCIENCE.

Cromie, W. J. Keeping Physically Fit. Macmillan.
Hazard, Daniel L. Results of Observations Made at the U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey Magnetic Observatory at Cheltenham, Md. 1913-14. Washington: Government Printing Office.
Journal of Genetics. Edited by W. Bateson and R. C. Punnett. Cambridge University Press. 10s. net.
Weld, L. D. H. The Marketing of Farm Products. Macmillan.

DRAMA AND MUSIC.

Ervine, St. J. John Ferguson. Macmillan. $1 net.

TEXTBOOKS.

Allen, P. S., and Phillipson, P. H. A First German Grammar. Boston: Ginn. $1.
Harris, F. S., and Stewart, G. The Principles of Agronomy. Macmillan.
Moore, E. C. What Is Education? Boston: Ginn. $1.25 net.

Robert Frost (*The New American Poet*)

NORTH OF BOSTON

"An authentic original voice in literature."—EDWARD GARNETT in *The Atlantic Monthly.* (*6th printing.* $1.25 *net.*)

A BOY'S WILL

A volume of Mr. Frost's early verses, uniform with "North of Boston."
2nd printing. (*75 cents net.*)

Henry Holt & Co. 34 W. 33d Street New York

Father Payne

12°. 430 pages. $1.50 *net.*

"Supposing Father Payne were a picture, the gallery visitors of the future would be puzzled whether to label it 'School of A. C. Benson,' or 'A. C. Benson (?),' or boldly 'A. C. Benson.' Any one or other of the three would believe that they must affix to it. A book that will interest the general reader even more than it will interest the man of letters on his craftsman's side." — *London Times.*

All Booksellers

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
New York **London**

Studies in History, Economics and Public Law

Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University.

Vol. 67, No. 1. RUSSIAN SOCIOLOGY
A Contribution to the History of Sociological Thought and Theory

By JULIUS F. HECKER, Ph.D. 8*vo. Paper Covers, pp.* 309. $2.50; *Cloth,* $3.00.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., Publishers

WINTER TRIPS AND CRUISES

To Florida, Alabama, the Carolinas, Texas, Mexico, Porto Rico, Nassau in the Bahamas, Cuba, Santo Domingo. Write for illustrated literature and rates.

AGWI LINES
BOSTON 192 Washington St. PHILADELPHIA 701 Chestnut St.
NEW YORK, 290 BROADWAY

Nervousness—Symptom NOT Disease

Nervousness is due to habits which may be corrected without difficulty. This is fully explained by Dr. John Harvey Kellogg in his new book, "Neurasthenia." In this book, Dr. Kellogg gives you results of his nearly forty years' experience as Superintendent of the Battle Creek Sanitarium, where he has had opportunity to observe, treat, and prescribe for thousands of cases of nervousness. He, therefore, deals *with facts—not theory.* What he tells you is easy to understand—and easy to follow right in your own home. Dr. Kellogg tells you how to apply the natural means of relief. His new book contains 300 pages, with many illustrations and complete instructions for diet, exercise, rest, and sleep. Price, only $2, postpaid in the U. S. Order to-day. You take no risk because, if you are not entirely satisfied, you may return the book at once for prompt refund. If you tire quickly, suffer from exhaustion and sleeplessness or any other nervous disorder, you may learn how to quickly overcome the difficulty and rid yourself of the condition, by studying Dr. Kellogg's book. Natural methods only. No drugs. Order the book to-day and find relief from nerve suffering. Send order and remittance to

GOOD HEALTH PUBLISHING CO., 7801 W. [illegible] in St., Battle Creek, Mich.

Or—Ask Your Book-seller

The Number of Subscribers of

The Nation

for the Year 1915 Increased

25%

over the Year 1914

As THE NATION makes no sensational appeal for subscribers, this remarkable increase must be due to the merit of its contents.

This twenty-five per cent. increase shows that NATION readers are recommending THE NATION to their friends, and that no eloquence is needed to disclose its continued improvement and the value of THE NATION to its subscribers.

This twenty-five per cent. proves that THE NATION is the favorite weekly of lovers of good literature, and that it maintains more securely than ever the position it has held since its foundation in 1865 as

America's Foremost Critical Review

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED